

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

THERE is a most interesting story in the fourteenth chapter of the First Book of Samuel. It occurs in the very heart of the struggle between Israel and the Philistines. These two tiny neighbouring nations were in fierce conflict for the supremacy. And the whole world was looking on. For what would it have been to the world if the Philistines had prevailed? Would Isaiah have come from Ashkelon? Would the Messiah have been born in Ashdod?

The supremacy fell to Israel. And the world will ever remember with gratitude the names of the men who secured it. Certainly there is not one of them but would have said that the arm of the Lord had done it. Samuel and David, Saul and his son Jonathan—in this they would unite sincerely, and even fervently, crying, ‘Not unto us, O Lord, not unto us.’ But the work of God on earth is done by human hands. The world will ever remember gratefully the names of Samson, of Samuel and David, of Saul, and of Saul’s son Jonathan.

In the fourteenth chapter of the First Book of Samuel Jonathan is the hero. Saul is king. And he behaves with a certain kingly superiority to consequence. But Jonathan is the hero. In no romance of boyhood do we follow the hero’s fortunes with the breathless interest with which we

still watch Jonathan and his armour-bearer as they agree to go over together to ‘the Philistines’ garrison that is on yonder side.’ For the modern romance always omits one element of interest, the most deeply moving of all. It is the challenge to God. At every step of the foolhardiest enterprise God is called upon to show Himself on the side of the brave. It was not a clear conception of the will of God. It made Him appear sometimes to be the author of actions which were none of His. The challenge to God was not always quite separate from selfishness. But it was a religious act. No enterprise was ever undertaken on the toss of a coin. The modern writer of romance who leaves God out altogether, leaves out the most deeply and universally thrilling element in a narrative of adventure. ‘Come,’ said Jonathan, ‘and let us go over unto the garrison of these uncircumcised: it may be that the Lord will work for us: for there is no restraint to the Lord to save by many or by few.’

But as we pass on through the entrancing story—the consternation of the Philistines and the rout, the astonishment in the army of Saul, the discovery of the absence of Jonathan, the pursuit, Saul’s inconsiderate command that all food should be tabu till the evening, the enlightening of Jonathan’s eyes through the tasting of the forbidden honey, the roll-call and the discovery of

the culprit—we are at last pulled up by a passage which we cannot understand.

It is the forty-first verse of the chapter. 'Then said Saul unto all Israel, Be ye on one side, and I and Jonathan my son will be on the other side. And the people said unto Saul, Do what seemeth good unto thee. Therefore Saul said unto the Lord, the God of Israel, Shew the right. And Jonathan and Saul were taken by lot; but the people escaped.' It is the phrase 'Shew the right' that is not intelligible. When we turn to the Hebrew text we find that it consists of only two words. And we see that, as pointed, they scarcely admit of an intelligible translation. 'Shew the right' is little more than a clever shot at the meaning, made by the Revisers of the Old Testament. On their margin they suggest 'Give a perfect lot,' which is the translation of the Bishops' Bible and of the Authorized Version. Coverdale tries, 'Do that right is'; Matthew, 'Give perfect knowledge'; while the margin of the Authorized Version suggests 'Shew the innocent.' Thus the Revised Version is not even original. It is a combination of Coverdale and the A.V. margin, adopted from a reasonable supposition of what the context requires.

The trouble is in the Hebrew. 'As a matter of fact,' says Dr. Buchanan Gray, 'and as scholars, whether Protestant or Roman Catholic, have now perceived, the Hebrew text has suffered a considerable loss at this point owing to that common source of error, *homoioteleuton*.' From the first occurrence in the original text of the words 'Lord God of Israel,' the eye of the scribe passed at once to their second occurrence. Whereupon one occurrence of that phrase as well as the words between were lost to the Hebrew text. But they were preserved in the Greek translation. Through it they passed into the Old Latin versions. And although Jerome translated directly from the Hebrew, the influence of the Old Latin secured their reinsertion in the Vulgate. From the Vulgate they passed into Wyclif, the Great Bible,

and later editions of the Douai Bible. Thus in the Great Bible the verse reads as follows (the portion which is not found in the Hebrew being placed within parenthesis): Therefore Saul said unto the Lord God of Israel: 'Give a perfect lot (Lord God, give Thou the judgment. How happeneth it, that Thou givest Thy servant no answer to-day? If this sin be in me or in Jonathan my son, shew it; or if this iniquity be in Thy people). And Saul and Jonathan were caught, but the people escaped free.' This is easier to understand. It would have been clearer if the technical terms had been taken over instead of being translated. Dr. Gray takes them over. And then for the crucial sentence he obtains the perfectly intelligible translation: 'If this iniquity be in me, or in Jonathan my son, give Urim; or if this iniquity be in thy people Israel, give Thummim.'

The passage is discussed in a paper by Professor Buchanan Gray on 'The Text of the Old Testament,' which occurs in a volume entitled *Mansfield College Essays* (Hodder & Stoughton; 12s. net). The volume has been prepared on the occasion of the seventieth birthday of Dr. A. M. Fairbairn. It contains as many as eighteen essays. And yet there is not one of them (for we have found the book worth reading from beginning to end) that does not make some profitable contribution to the subject which it handles. But let us return meantime for a moment to Dr. Gray.

The remarkable thing which comes out of the discussion of our passage in the First Book of Samuel is that those versions which are furthest removed from the original Hebrew contain the best translation. The English Versions of the Bible may be divided into two classes—the primary and the secondary. The primary versions have been translated direct from the Hebrew. They are Tindale's, the Genevan, the A.V. and the R.V. The secondary are translations of another translation. They are Wyclif's, Coverdale's, and the Douai Bible. And the remarkable thing, we say,

is that in this case at least the secondary English Versions are the better.

The discovery raises a question which is of the greatest moment in the translation of the Old Testament. What place should be given to the Ancient Versions? The Revisers practically gave them no place at all. Dr. Buchanan Gray has no hesitation in holding that on that account, if on that account alone, we ought as soon as possible to entertain the idea of superseding the Revised Version of the Old Testament by a new translation.

When Alexander the Great conquered Asia he conquered it for Christ. For when Christ said to His disciples, 'Go ye into all the world,' He sent them to a world to which Alexander had given a common language. And wherever they went they found people who could understand them, as they spoke the Greek language of their own ordinary conversation.

This common tongue is called the *Koinê*. We must become familiar with that word. Properly speaking, it is a Greek adjective (*κοινή*) meaning common, and it is understood to qualify the Greek substantive meaning dialect (*διάλεκτος*). But it is now used freely as a substantive itself. What does it signify?

The fullest account in English of what the *Koinê* is will be found in the first volume of Professor Moulton's *Grammar of New Testament Greek*. There is a shorter account of it in Mr. Thackeray's *Grammar of the Septuagint*, the first volume of which has just been published at the Cambridge University Press. Mr. Thackeray adopts the definition of it which has been given by Professor Thumb of Marburg, 'the man who has done more than any other to promote a study of it and to point the way to its correct appreciation.' The *Koinê*, says Professor Thumb, is 'the sum total of the development of the Greek of common and commercial speech from the time

of Alexander the Great to the close of ancient history.'

From the time of Alexander the Great. For when Alexander the Great began the conquest of the world the Greek language was separated into dialects. Some of the motley host which composed his army spoke Attic Greek, some spoke Ionic, some Doric. But as they associated with one another in the long marches by day or round the camp fires by night, their dialectical peculiarities disappeared. They had to understand one another. They had to learn to use a common tongue. The dialects were thrown into one large melting-pot, out of which came the *Koinê*.

It is true that before the time of Alexander something must have been done towards wearing off the edges of the Greek dialects. Tradesmen from different parts of Greece had been exchanging language as well as merchandise. And the Ten Thousand in their retreat across Asia, under the leadership of Xenophon, had almost forgotten that they had ever spoken different dialects when at the end of their heroic journey they shouted, 'The sea, the sea!' and fell upon one another's necks and wept. Yet the fusion of the dialects on the large scale took place under Alexander, and became final. It was Alexander who gave a universally understood or 'common' language to the civilized world.

It is called the *Koinê* not because it was the language of common men, but because it became the language of the whole civilized world. It became the language of those States which hitherto had used different Greek dialects. With the single exception of the Old Laconic, which still held its own in the fastnesses of the Peloponnesus and lives on in the modern Zaconic, none of the old dialects survived in the competition with it. But it not only displaced the old dialects of Greece, it also became the language of nations which hitherto had been guiltless of speaking Greek. Our own knowledge of it has come largely

from the discovery of papyrus rolls, and these papyri have been discovered almost entirely in Egypt.

But for all that, we must remember, and we shall not understand the Koinê if we do not remember, that it was the speech of common men. It emerged from the necessities of daily intercourse. It could not sweep away the literary language of Greece, the language of the great poets and historians as it swept away the dialects. That literary language may refuse to disappear even before a majority vote in an English University. But so different are the literary language and the Koinê, that when the Koinê was found in the Septuagint and in the New Testament it was considered necessary to give it a distinctive name, and for a long time it was called by the name of Biblical Greek.

There is no such thing as Biblical Greek. The Greek of the Bible is the Koinê. For that which sprang up in the necessities of intercourse was found capable of sufficient polish to be made use of by writers like Polybius, Josephus, the Seventy, and even St. Paul.

We have to be ready always to give an answer concerning the hope that is in us. And sometimes it has to be the statement of truth and sometimes the refutation of error. But, either way, it must be appropriate to the time and the circumstances in which it is given. The simplicity of the gospel becomes darker than the darkest speculations of philosophy if it is spoken in unfamiliar language. But the preacher's supreme mistake is to occupy himself with objections which were made by a generation that is dead and gone.

For this makes his preaching both uninteresting and unprofitable. Relying upon books which he found in his father's library, he continues to reprove Tindale and to answer Huxley. But these men have received their reward. And the new generation, which has almost forgotten their names, is quite unconcerned with the wisdom or

the folly with which they spake on earth. The students of a theological college recently asked one of their professors if anything had been said about the Book of Acts since the days of Baur and Zeller, and they enjoyed their own grim irony. These students will soon be preachers. Will they preach as if the conflict were still between faith and unbelief, or between a materialist and a spiritual theory of the universal, or between idealism and agnosticism?

These, says Dr. Neville Figgis, were the issues of the last generation. They are not the issues now. Dr. Figgis was the Hulsean Lecturer for 1908-9. He has published his lectures under the title of *The Gospel and Human Needs* (Longmans; 4s. 6d. net). As Hulsean Lecturer he knew that he was called upon to give an answer concerning the faith that is in him. And the very first question that he set himself to answer was, Where does the attack come from to-day? It does not come from the agnostics. It does not come from the materialists. It does not come from unbelievers. The attack to-day, says Dr. Figgis, comes from those who say that Christianity is one among many good religions.

Now it may be that Dr. Figgis is looking forward a little in his answer. But it is the business of the apologist and the preacher to look forward. Dr. Figgis may be looking forward a little, but it is certain that even if the full flood of anti-Christian religiousness is not yet upon us, it is already the one issue worth fearing and facing.

Haeckel is still alive. But the issue is not materialism. It is now recognized that man must profess a religion of some kind. If he is an animal, he is a religious animal and not a brute. The only question now is, which religion? The lists are thrown open. Many are entering the competition. Some of them, says Dr. Figgis, are very queer religions. But they claim to be religions. They would have no standing otherwise. And they have their advocates. Even Herbert Spencer's

agnosticism had to be called 'semi-theism' as time went on. And Positivists like Mr. Frederic Harrison are as emphatic as any Christian in condemning the blackness of materialism. In *The Creed of a Layman*, he says, 'We must give human nature its fair chance and accept what it demands; and if human nature calls out for Religion, religion it must have.'

Are we to allow Christianity to enter this competition? We must allow it. We have hung back hitherto. We have spoken contemptuously about parliaments of religion. We have refused to look at any other religion than our own. It is all due to the device of the devil. Now we must reject this subtle appeal to our pride and our indolence. Already it is taken for granted that Christianity has entered and been thrown. Man must have a Religion. The exact form of the Religion of the future may not yet be agreed upon. It is condescendingly admitted that Christianity may contribute some elements to it. But it is taken for granted and expressed with great assurance, in innumerable cheap books and cheaper magazine articles, that the good Lord Jesus has had His day.

We must allow Christianity to enter the competition. But we must see to it that it is Christianity that enters. Now, Christianity is the Religion of the supernatural. Certainly it is an ethical religion, and its ethics may be compared with the ethics of Confucius or the Stoa. But if it is allowed to enter into the competition as an ethical religion only, it is not Christianity that is allowed to enter. Dr. Conybeare, in his new book *Myth, Magic, and Morals*, has shown us what can be made of a Christianity that is first stripped of its supernaturalism. Other religions may be supernatural also. Many of them claim to be. Let them come, bringing their supernaturalism with them. We are willing to try the spirits wherever they are said to be found. But we must insist upon it, that it is unscientific and outrageous first to reject the possibility of a

resurrection and then to say that 'on His grave the Syrian stars look down.'

We do not need to deny the things that are common to Christianity and other religions. As Dr. Figgis says: 'We cannot now echo the vaunt of St. Augustine about the virtues of the pagan world being *splendida vitia*; or treat Muhammad as merely a false prophet. Nor can we deny the immense amount of interaction between the religion of Israel and other earlier systems. Above all, the knowledge of Mithraic worship in the Roman Empire has revealed the striking interdependence of the Christian Church and other cults.' But the question is not, has Christianity borrowed this or that? Nor even, is Christianity superior in this or that respect to other religions? The claim which we make for Christianity is that it is altogether unique, its uniqueness consisting in this, that it is a revelation of God to man, given in the Person of One who is at once God and Man, Christ Jesus.

We make this claim. Can we make it good? Well, the first thing that we have to take into account is the fact that the same claim is made by other religions also. And the mere statement of this fact is considered to be enough to dispose of the Christian claim. We must consider the claims of other religions. We must dispose of them. Both historically and experimentally we must show that except the name of Jesus there is none other name given under heaven among men whereby we must be saved. How are we to approach the subject? We may approach it by the way of history or by the way of experience.

Now when we approach the problem historically we are met at once by the objection that a religion which makes this claim makes a mistake, since it is impossible that God could select a certain moment of time in the history of the world to make a unique revelation of Himself. And when we approach it experimentally we are met by the objection that it is just as impossible that the

Eternal Spirit could concrete Himself in any particular person. These are the two main objections which the present age urges against the revelation of God in Christ. Dr. Figgis takes them in order.

The first objection is that we are told to fix our thoughts upon a particular moment of time, the moment when Jesus was born in Bethlehem. That is a moment in the past, and we need something of the historical imagination even to fix our thoughts upon it. But the difficulty is not so much that it is a moment in the past as that it is a moment in time. It is said to be incredible that any particular moment should be lifted out of the infinite number of moments in the history of the world and stamped for ever with this significance. What is the apologist's answer?

Dr. Figgis answers that the only thing in time that ever has significance is the moment. It is a difficult answer. But it is true, and it may be made triumphant. 'The value of monumental moments,' says Dr. Figgis, 'the feeling before some work of beauty that here at last is something finished, done for ever, that time and chance have no power upon the idea thus embodied, is inseparable from the sense of all greatness in art and life.' For confirmation he sends us to the English poet who has done most to express this truth, to Browning. All we have willed or hoped or dreamed of good shall exist;

Not in its semblance, but itself; no beauty, nor good,
nor power

Whose voice has gone forth, but each survives for the
melodist

When eternity affirms the conception of an hour.

But the second is the supreme objection—that Christianity professes to find the Eternal Spirit in a particular person. Dr. Figgis supposes that it is the supreme and peremptory crux in the Incarnation. 'Think what it means. That infant at Bethlehem, God, the centre of all our worship, the source of all our being, the meaning of all our thought. Is it not "a thing imagination boggles at"?' And he frankly says it is.

But immediately he adds that it is just this central paradox of the Gospel which gives it its charm for the common heart. There are only the two alternatives—the abstraction of the speculative thinker, or God concrete in Jesus the satisfaction of human need.

And it is the only revelation that was waiting to be made. We knew already that God is great. We had discerned His greatness in the sublimity of the order in which we are placed. 'God is great,' the cry of the Muslims, is a truth which it needed no supernatural being to teach men.

But that *God is little*—that is the truth which Jesus taught man. And the heart of Christendom has gone out to the story of Bethlehem and the manger, of the shepherds and the wise men, to the blessing of the children, to the words about the sparrows and the lilies. It is God in His humiliation, scorned, spat upon, dying, that has won the Christian and will win the world.

Blasphemy.

A STUDY IN THE EASTERN ATMOSPHERE OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

BY THE REV. G. M. MACKIE, M.A., D.D., BEYROUT, SYRIA.

WHILE the name of Christ provided a new personality to be revered or to be spoken against, and the Christian life imposed new restraints upon the spirit of malediction, yet among the Christians of the N.T. blasphemy had for the most part the same significance that it had among other Oriental peoples. It included (1) whatever was irreverent, defiant, or offensive towards God; (2) the profanation of any sacred office, observance, or institution; and (3) the language of invective and denunciation that was called forth by any teaching or behaviour that seemed to be hostile to religion and morals.

In this last sense blasphemy was not confined to any official declaration of anathema or excommunication, but extended to the angry invective and coarse malediction in which the Jews indulged when it was declared to them that Jesus was the Messiah, and that the Kingdom of God was for the Gentiles also. The habit of blaspheming or of invoking divine punishment was so general, and so commended rather than condoned as an act of royalty to the faith, that the complete avoidance of it, and of the spirit that produced it, became one of the marks of the new creature in Christ Jesus.

The study of these Oriental conditions in N.T. times is interesting not only as showing what the teaching of the gospel had to contend against, but as explaining how those traditional views of the sanctity of institutions and of corporate union afterwards influenced the Church in the matter of laying its curse or interdict on individuals or nations, and in attempting to inflict actual punishment upon them.

The following considerations may be mentioned as explaining the intensity of feeling among Orientals with regard to blasphemy in its relationship to God, and the religious value of cursing as between man and man.

1. In the East religion is the chief fact of human life. When Moses put the emblem of the Divine presence in the centre of the resting-places and at the head of the movements of Israel in the wilderness, he gave pictorial ex-

pression to a universal religious feeling. This does not mean that there is a general desire towards spirituality and sainthood, but that religion gives to every man his position, and is the strongest bond of fellowship and the chief means of protection. An Oriental will scarcely ever for the sake of truth and justice give evidence in court against a fellow-believer and in favour of one of another faith.

2. God is God. He is never referred to as our idealized conception of power and righteousness. His existence is in no way dependent on our perceptive faculties, nor is His nature affected by what we believe, or do not believe, concerning Him. Any such speculation can arise only from a heart that in its foolishness hopes that God is not. While man's thought of God is nothing, it is, on the other hand, of the utmost importance to bear in mind what God thinks of us.

3. All who have come to know Him, and to belong to Him, by the teaching of one or more of His prophets, become thereby His people. Each one can say, 'Whose I am, and whom I serve,' and it is believed that He in return is not ashamed to be called their God. As they exist by His protection and bear His name, they must live for His glory. As the religion represents the entire people, the entire people must represent the religion. Any desertion from the aggregate of membership is so much lost to the witnessing and serving power of the community, and therefore to the glory of God. Hence the feeling of intense malignity towards apostasy and schism.

Such is the solidarity of the religious community in the East that on an occasion of murder or blood-feud, when the actual perpetrator of the crime cannot be found, another man of the same religion, though innocent of the crime and even unaware of its occurrence, is put to death as a substitute.

4. Again, among Orientals words of blessing and cursing are on the same level as alike tending to find fulfilment in actual life. Thus, when a

visitor leaves an Oriental home, his host's last words to the departing guest are, 'Give peace,' meaning thereby that he desires his goodwill or blessing to be given to any friend of his who may be met with by the way. Similarly, it is understood that a malediction or curse regarded as originating in righteous indignation and submitted to the will of the Judge of the whole earth will also be granted a suitable fulfilment.

5. Further, as an Oriental is never regarded as a unit, but as a member of some community, and as his opinion, standards, and actions are judged to be those of his class, it follows that the blasphemy, that is, the malediction or curse, is seldom directed against the individual as such, but against the religion that controls and directs both his life and the life of those to whom he belongs. Such everyday imprecations of the street are, 'May your house (circle of relatives) become a ruin,' 'A curse upon your religion, upon the religion of your father, upon the religion of your ancestors.' Such blasphemy or railing is in its most intense and aggravated form when it is aimed at the prophet or religious head of the community. In Turkey the offence of blaspheming the name of Muhammad, though now commuted to fine and imprisonment, involved death by execution, burning, or impaling.

This is expressed in the Arabic proverbial rhyme:

Il-şarimu maslûl, âla şâtîm il-rasûl

('Drawn is the sword, for him who curses the prophet of the Lord').

An Oriental may listen submissively to the severest strictures on his personal conduct and accept such rebukes as paternal chastisement meant for his benefit, but he at once becomes resentful and malignant if his personal delinquencies are described as those of his people, and as the mark of his religious fraternity. He considers it to be his duty to repudiate such a charge instantly and with the utmost vigour, and he will call upon his fellow-religionists to unite with him in bringing counter-charges against the 'blasphemer.' Self-defence then becomes a public duty, a sacred championship.

When this deeply established custom is viewed in its various connexions with Oriental social and religious life, it becomes apparent how great a force was needed to uproot it, and put in its place the principle, 'Bless, and curse not' (Ro 12¹⁴).

In the N.T. the charge of blasphemy was brought

against Christ because, in declaring the forgiveness of sins and in speaking of His oneness with the Father, He seemed to be putting a man of flesh and blood in the place of God (Mt 9³ 26⁶⁵ Jn 10³³ 19⁷). Inferior in degree, but still an act of blasphemy, was irreverent speech towards parents (Mt 15⁴ Mk 7¹⁰), and against those in high office or rank (2 P 2¹¹). The spirit of loyal and reverent discipleship is pained to hear the blaspheming or upbraiding addressed to Christ on the cross by the Jews and by His companions in suffering (Mt 27³⁹, Lk 23³⁹).

After years of devoted service Paul remembers with bitter regret that he had once been a blasphemer of Christ (1 Ti 1¹³), and that he had tried by torture to compel others to blaspheme the name of their Lord (Ac 26¹¹). When the Jews of Antioch in Pisidia (13⁴⁵), and in Corinth (18⁸), poured contempt upon the name of Christ, Paul would hear his own words of 'blasphemy' given back to him in the terms of insult that are still thrown at Christ, namely, the bastard of Bethlehem, the hanged one, the liar, the deceiver, the magician. The vehemence of feeling that found relief in such railing sometimes led to delirious and precipitate action, as in the martyrdom of Stephen. The narrative describes the shouting crowd, the stopping of horrified ears, the simultaneous onset and the swift dragging of the offender outside the city to the place of stoning (7⁵⁷).

In the Epistles, Christian believers are exhorted so to walk that their conduct may give no provocation to those who are without, and that the word of God may not be blasphemed, or have a curse called down upon it by any inconsistency or lawlessness in the life of Christ's followers (Ro 14¹⁶, Ja 3^{9, 10}). The spirit of blaspheming, in its motive and expression, is condemned as an evil thing. It has its home in the unpurified human heart (Mt 15¹⁹, 1 Ti 6⁴), and its companions there are bitterness, wrath, anger, clamour, malice, shameful speaking, and whatever is ready to rejoice in the depreciation of others (Eph 4³¹, Col 3⁸). Its precise opposite is the spirit of Christian love which 'taketh no account of evil' (1 Co 13⁵).

In the English language blasphemy is confined to whatever is irreverent towards God, and in a second degree to the profanation or desecration of what is connected with religious worship. The word is not used in the further sense of

invoking divine punishment on those who offend with regard to other relationships. This may be due partly to the fact that when the gospel was brought to the West it established itself among a people who had not those Oriental traditions which gave religious sanction to malediction.

In the papacy of mediæval Europe, on the assumption that St. Peter's successor represented St. Peter, and St. Peter Christ, and Christ God, it was a legitimate inference that any king or prince who disobeyed the Pope had no further claim on the devout loyalty of his people. He had blasphemed and was under a curse. But though such anathematizing and excommunication might be attempted by high ecclesiastical authority, the invoking of divine punishment never found a

place in the common life of the West corresponding to the 'blasphemies' or imprecatory railings of Oriental custom.

The attempts at coercion in matters of belief that convulsed the Christian Church in Europe were largely due to the view that the Reformation was a schism, and that schism was an act of blasphemy against the Holy Church, the body of Christ. The union which the Eastern Church sought to secure by creed, and the Roman Church by authority, and the Protestant Church by the appeal to the Bible and to conscience, is still the master thought of the Christian Church, and the divisions and contentions which retard the progress of the Kingdom form the chief profanation of the name of Christ.

The Great Text Commentary.

THE GREAT TEXTS OF REVELATION.

REVELATION II. 7.

'To him that overcometh, to him will I give to eat of the tree of life that is in the Paradise of God.'—R.V.

THE SITUATION.

This is the promise made to the first of the Seven Churches of Asia, the Church in Ephesus. Ramsay and others discover a special appropriateness in each promise to its own Church, but it is difficult to make the appropriateness always evident. Here certainly there is the promise of food, the tree of life being a fruit tree, and the Ephesians are commended for their hatred of the doctrine of the Nicolaitans, who recommended the eating of food offered in sacrifice to idols. But the Nicolaitans occur also in the Epistle to Pergamum. More generally, Ramsay says that Ephesus had been falling from its original high level of enthusiasm, and for this the fruit of the tree of life is the one infallible cure. Boyd Carpenter brings these two suggestions together: (1) those who had not indulged in the licence of the Nicolaitans shall eat of the tree of life; and (2) the Ephesian Christians, who had lost the paradise of the first loving communion with God, are promised a restored paradise and participation in the tree of life.

THE LANGUAGE.

There is no serious difficulty with the wording.

1. *To him that overcometh.* It is a present participle—not 'has overcome,' or 'will overcome,' or even 'is overcoming,' but 'the conqueror,' the victorious member of the Church, as such, apart from all consideration of circumstances (Swete). The idea is characteristic of St. John; this word occurs once in the Gospel, six times in the First Epistle, sixteen times in the Apocalypse; and elsewhere only in Lk 11²², Ro 3⁴ 12²¹.

2. *To him.* The repetition (omitted in A.V.) is due to anacoluthon, that is, failure in carrying out the originally intended structure of the sentence; cf. 2^{17, 26} 3^{12, 21}. The sentence is probably constructed after the Hebrew. Blass quotes a striking example from the Septuagint of Gn 28¹³.

3. *To eat of the tree* is lit. 'to eat from (ἐκ) the tree,' i.e. to eat of the fruit that comes from it. We have the same word in the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, Levi 18^{10, 11}.

And he shall open the gates of paradise,
And shall remove the threatening sword against Adam.
And he shall give to the saints to eat from the tree of life,
And the spirit of holiness shall be on them.

4. *In the Paradise.* A.V., following the Textus Receptus, has 'in the midst of the Paradise,' but the manuscript authority for the reading is insufficient. It was probably added from a recollection of the passage in Gn 2⁹.

THE SERMON.

The most natural division of the text is into the three parts of (1) the Gift, (2) the Giver, (3) the Recipients; and this is the division which Dr. Maclaren adopts. But such a division would suit others of the promises equally well. For the sake of distinction let us take (1) the garden of God, (2) the tree of life in it, and (3) the eating of the tree of life.

I. THE GARDEN OF GOD. 1. Of the gardens mentioned in Scripture three are especially notable—the Garden of Eden, the Garden of Gethsemane, and the Garden of God. They are associated with the whole history of man. One is at the beginning of his history, one in the middle, and one at the end. They also express the essential facts in his spiritual history. Eden is the place of innocence; Gethsemane is the place of testing; the Garden of God is the place of rest after victory.¹

2. The garden of God is called in our text the Paradise of God. That is to say, the Greek word (*παράδεισος*) is transliterated and not translated. This Greek word has a history. It is itself a transliteration of the Persian *pairidaēza*, which meant a royal pleasure park with its forest and fruit trees. This was the special meaning of the Greek word at first. But the Greeks forgot the original meaning and used the word simply for a garden. This is its meaning in the Septuagint. And this meaning has been found on the Inscriptions in the Papyri. But, again, in the New Testament we find that it takes on a new special meaning. It is used for the abode of the blest.² The word occurs three times. In Lk 23⁴³ ('To-day shalt thou be with me in Paradise') it simply means the state or place of the blessed dead; in 2 Co 12⁴ it means that supramundane sphere identified with the third heaven, into which men pass in an ecstasy; while here (Rev 2⁷) it is the final joy of the saints in the presence of God and of Christ.³

3. Is this paradise in heaven or on earth? It is usually identified with heaven. In the New

Testament, says Dr. Salmond, the primeval Eden gives place to a garden of God that is not of earth, the thought of the Paradise of the past is lost in the hope of a Paradise of the future, and the word becomes a name for the scene of rest and recompense for the righteous after death.⁴ That is the sense in which Dr. Maclaren unhesitatingly uses it in his sermon on this text.⁵ But Dr. Matheson earnestly pleads for the view that the second Paradise, like the first, is on earth. And certainly the Jewish Paradise of the time, as we find it in Apocalyptic books like Enoch, in the references which the Gospels contain to the Jewish expectation of the Kingdom of God, and in the Book of Revelation itself, is not above the clouds or beyond the tomb, but on earth. It is the earth itself indeed, renewed and made the abode of new men in Christ Jesus. But the distinction is not to be pressed. The Paradise promised to the penitent robber was after death, while Paul was still in the body when he entered the Paradise of his ecstasy. It is not yet a present possession, but a future promise. And Dr. Matheson is right in this at least, that we are to strive with all our might to realize it even here.⁶

Grow old along with me!

The best is yet to be,

The last of life, for which the first was made:

Our times are in His hand

Who saith, 'A whole I planned,

Youth shows but half; trust God: see all nor be afraid!

Therefore I summon age

To grant youth's heritage,

Life's struggle having so far reached its term:

Thence shall I pass, approved

A man, for aye removed

From the developed brute; a god though in the germ.⁷

4. What are the characteristics of the new Paradise? (1) The consequences of the Fall are reversed, and the primeval blessedness of man is restored in Christ; (2) this blessedness is secured from loss or change; (3) there is the immediate presence and vision of God.⁸ It is for this reason that it is called the garden of God. His presence is its consecration. Hort observes that the term Eden, 'delight,' does not appear in the Apocalypse,

⁴ Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*, iii. 669^a.

⁵ A. Maclaren, *The Victor's Crowns*, p. 1.

⁶ See Matheson, *Sidelights from Pamos*, p. 17.

⁷ Browning, 'Rabbi Ben Ezra.'

⁸ J. Oswald Dykes, in *Christian World Pulpit*, xxix. 248.

¹ See W. Lee, *From Dust to Jewels*, p. 146.

² See Deissmann, *Bible Studies*, p. 148.

³ See Swete, *Apocalypse*.

so that what is conveyed by 'paradisaical' is misleading. God, not delight, supplies the characteristic.

How know I that it looms lovely that land I have never
seen,
With morning glories and heartsease and unexampled
green,
With neither heat nor cold in the balm-redolent air?
Some of this, not all, I know; but this is so:
Christ is there.

How know I that blessedness befalls who dwell in
Paradise,
The outwearied hearts refreshing, rekindling the worn-out
eyes;
All souls singing, seeing, rejoicing everywhere?
Nay, much more than this I know: for this is so:
Christ is there.

O Lord Christ Whom having not seen I love and desire
to love,
O Lord Christ Who lookest on me uncomely yet still thy
dove,
Take me to Thee in Paradise, Thine own made fair:
For whatever else I know, this thing is so:
Thou art there.¹

2. THE TREE OF LIFE. **1.** The tree has been associated with divinity in the religion of nearly all the nations of the earth. The Greeks of Ephesus were familiar with it as a symbol of life-giving divine power. The Jews were equally familiar with the idea. Of the idealized Tree of Life, says Swete, we read already in Pr 3¹⁸, but its first appearance in a vision of the celestial Paradise is in *Enoch*. Thus the writer of the Apocalypse found the tree of life in his own Jewish sphere of thought, the tree that was in the midst of the garden of Eden being already used for spiritual purposes in the prophetic literature; but he was aware that the symbol was intelligible also to the Asian Greeks.

Trees had been worshipped as the home of the Divine nature and power from time immemorial, and were still so worshipped, in Asia Minor as in the ancient world generally. On some sacred tree the prosperity and safety of a family or tribe or city was often believed to depend. When the sacred olive-tree on the Acropolis of Athens put forth a new shoot after the city had been burned by the Persians, the people knew that the safety of the State was assured. The belief was widely entertained that the life of a man was connected with some tree, and returned into that tree when he died. The tree which grew on a grave was often thought to be penetrated with the spirit and life of the buried man; and an old Athenian law punished with death any one that

had cut a holm-oak growing in a sepulchral ground, *i.e.* heroön.²

2. What is the meaning of the tree of life? It is of course a fruit tree, and the eating of the fruit of it gives life. But what is life? It is in the pursuit of 'life' that men make money, seek pleasure, follow fame. But whatever life these make they do not make life that lasts.

Love, fame, ambition, avarice, 'tis the same;
For all are meteors with a different name,
And death the sable smoke, where vanishes the flame.³

To eat of the tree of life is to have eternal life. And this eternal life is not a mere continuance of conscious being. Just as we say of men who are sunk in gross animalism, or whose lives are devoted to trivial and transient aims, that theirs is not worth calling life, so we say that the only thing that deserves, and that in Scripture gets, the august name of 'life' is a condition of existence in conscious union with, and possession of, God, who is manifested and communicated to mortals through Jesus Christ His Son.⁴

Mr. G. T. Coster breaks up the life, as you might break up a ray of light, into these seven elements. (1) *Beauty*. It is in a garden. At the end of the Apocalypse it is in a city, but it is a city 'prepared as a bride adorned for her husband.' (2) *Knowledge*. 'The Lamb is the light thereof.' Christ no longer speaks to us in proverbs, but shows us plainly of the Father. (3) *Enjoyment*. Not the sensual pleasures of a Muhammadan paradise, but the satisfaction of spiritual powers. (4) *Fellowship*. They that fear God shall speak often one to another, especially of how they 'handled the Word of Life.'⁵ (5) *Holiness*. 'There shall not enter into it anything unclean.' The description is negative, because something unclean did enter into the first Paradise. But the holiness is after redemption, and positive and permanent. (6) *Rest in Service*. 'They shall

² W. M. Ramsay, *The Letters to the Seven Churches*, p. 247.

³ Momerie, *The Origin of Evil*, p. 314.

⁴ A. Maclaren, *The Victor's Crowns*, p. 1.

⁵ I remember hearing once of a little dying child shrinking timidly from the idea of going alone; but just before the end there came a spirit of sublime confidence, a supernatural opening of vision, a recognition of some companionship, and the little one cried out, 'I am not afraid; they are all here.'—Wilberforce, *Sermons preached in Westminster Abbey*, p. 161.

¹ Christina G. Rossetti, *The Face of the Deep*, p. 206.

rest from their labours.' 'Neither shall there be any more pain.' But 'His servants shall serve him.' Their service will be worship; their worship will be song. (7) *Eternity*. The life of the Tree of Life is incorruptible and undefiled and fadeth not away.

3. THE EATING OF THE TREE OF LIFE. It is to him that overcometh.

1. This word 'overcometh' is a great word with St. John, and it is especially frequent in the Apocalypse. That book, says Swete, is a record and a prophecy of victories won by Christ and the Church. The note of victory is dominant in St. John, as that of faith in St. Paul; or rather faith presents itself to St. John in the light of a victory (1 Jn 5⁴).

2. What is it that is overcome? St. John does not specify. It is just overcoming. It is patient continuance in well-doing. It is not the victory over a single temptation. It is continual overcoming, the life of victory. The final victory and its reward are the fruits of innumerable antecedent victories.¹

3. Still there are certain spheres in which the victory has usually to be obtained.

(1) Hort suggests a possible reference to the Greek games. It may be that some of the Ephesian Christians had once been runners or wrestlers or had been training for it. To overcome the desire even to witness the games was a great victory. Still more to overcome the desire to overcome. This is the usual verb (*νικάω*) found on the inscriptions for victory in the games.

(2) The victory is found in facing the tasks of life. The boy knows well enough that if he wants his kite to rise he must fly it in the teeth of the wind. It is easy enough to drift down-stream; but it is better to swim against the stream; the resistance of the water holds one up.

'I have a theory,' says Hubert Bland, in his volume of essays entitled 'With the Eyes of a Man,' 'I have a theory that the people which shortens its weapons wins its battles. I am not clear as to how that theory would work out in the sphere of lower warfare; but in the sphere of the higher warfare it is certainly true. If you want to win you must shorten your weapons; you must look your enemy in the white of his eyes; you must come to close grips with him.'—E. W. Lewis, *The Unescapeable Christ*, p. 228.

(3) It is found especially in suffering.

¹ C. Anderson Scott, *Revelation*, p. 139.

Wrote one of my friends to me the other day, from his home, which had suddenly been darkened by the shadow of death, and out of a heart stricken by one of the bitterest and sternest of earth's losses: 'I have never felt so near to God as I have done during the past week.' He had won past the flaming sword, and had eaten of the Tree of Life.

Said another of my friends to me not long ago, referring to a time in his life when everything that was stable in it seemed to be threatened by a tragic shock which robbed him of a friend as well as a father: 'I really never knew what it was to pray; I never knew the help and the power and the peace in prayer, until those dark days came and the burden almost crushed me to the ground.' He had won past the cherubim, and had eaten of the Tree of Life.—E. W. Lewis, *The Unescapeable Christ*, p. 220.

(4) But, above all, it is the victory over selfishness. 'I know,' said Dr. Welldon, as he resigned the headmastership of Harrow School, 'I know you will be brave in the face of danger; but oh—that I could be sure you would be equally brave in the face of temptation. You will conquer others; but, my boys, will you conquer yourselves?'²

4. This victory is *given*—and again we have one of the characteristic words of the Apocalypse. For the victory that overcometh the world is not our effort, but our faith. It is faith working itself out in effort, in effort of life and in endurance. 'Go into a mill,' says Dr. Maclaren, 'and in a quiet room, often detached from the main building, you will find the engine working, and seeming to do nothing but go up and down. But there is a shaft which goes through the wall and takes the power to the looms. We are working here, and we are making the cloth that we shall have to own, and say, 'Yes, it *is* my manufacture!' when we get yonder. According to our life to-day will be our destiny in that great to-morrow. Life is given to the victor, because the victor only is capable of possessing it.'³

Above the doorway of a house in Edinburgh there was once a legend which read as follows: 'He that tholes overcomes.' A youth who day after day passed that door, read the writing again and again, and as often wondered what it meant. One day he made inquiry, and found that to 'thole' was a pithy Scotch word which meant to *bear with patience*. He there and then made up his mind to *thole*. In after years that lad became one of the founders of the famous firm of Chambers, the publishers, and he, when relating his early experiences, unhesitatingly attributed his success in life to his early determination to *thole*. This

² *Youth and Duty*, p. 251.

³ *The Victor's Crowns*, p. 8.

message bears the same burden to us—it bids us *thole*, that we may overcome. It bids us be faithful, that we may be partakers of the tree of life, which is in the Paradise of God. It is a figure which carries us back in thought to the first Paradise and to the tree of life in the midst of the garden, and the promise cannot mean less than perfect

restoration to all the blessings and privileges which Adam lost. But it means more. To eat of the tree of life in the Paradise of God is better than to eat of the Symbolical tree of Eden. For Christ Himself is the true 'Tree of Life,' and to be a partaker of Him is to have life for evermore.

Recent Criticism of the Synoptic Gospels.

BY THE REV. WILLOUGHBY C. ALLEN, M.A., PRINCIPAL OF EGERTON HALL, MANCHESTER.

THE criticism of the Synoptic Gospels seems to have reached this point. It is very generally agreed that Matt. and Luke have edited and enlarged the Second Gospel. The points still debated in this connexion are details. The main fact is, as it would seem, undeniable. There is further a very widely held belief that Matt. and Luke had also before them a second source, consisting mainly of discourses; and for some years attempts have been made to reconstruct it, none of which have met with much approval.

It was at one time usual to call this alleged discourse source *the Logia*, but as that term seemed to beg disputable questions connected with a statement of Papias about *the Logia* written by Matthew, recent writers have preferred to adopt for it a colourless symbol Q (= Quelle). Harnack¹ has recently set himself to the reconstruction of Q, and as his results are likely to be widely accepted, it is the purpose of this paper to offer some criticism to both his methods and his results.²

A. Methods.—Briefly put, his method is to place in the source any section or saying that is found in both Matt. and Luke, but not in Mark. The assumption behind this is that wherever two writers agree closely in their records they are borrowing from a common source. As regards this I would only say that I am not prepared to contest the general position that the literary agreement between Matt. and Luke in sections common to them is so great that literary dependence in some form must be assumed.

But I would only urge that it does not follow from the fact that these two writers agree closely in many sections, that all these sections must have come

from a single source. They agree, *e.g.*, closely in the case of the Sermon on the Mount. They also agree closely in the account of St. John's preaching. It does not follow that the sermon and the account of John were found in the same common source. They may have been found there. They may also have been in two separate sources. So far as St. Luke is concerned, he expressly tells us that he was acquainted with the works of many gospel writers.

On this method of collecting together passages common to Matt. and Luke in which there is close verbal agreement, Harnack builds up a document which he supposes that these writers used. It contains:

1. An account of John's preaching.
2. The Temptation and perhaps the Baptism.
3. A good deal of the Sermon on the Mount, followed by the healing of the Centurion's servant.
4. The two aspirants.
5. Sayings to the disciples about their mission.
6. The discourse about the Baptist, with the two sequels, Woes against Bethsaida and Chorazin, and the Thanksgiving to the Father.
7. The Beelzebub section and sign of Jonah.
8. Woes against the Pharisees.
9. Discourse about the Parousia, and other sayings.

Now a document which contained the material above tabulated would be a very curious sort of gospel writing. Presumably the purpose of the writer was to collect noteworthy sayings of Christ, and most of the material is of that nature. But what then has the record of the preaching of the Baptist to do in such a work? This would be intelligible enough as an introduction in any historical or biographical narrative of Christ's

¹ *The Sayings of Jesus* ('Crown Theological Library').

² For criticisms of Harnack from a different point of view, see Dr. Moulton in the *Expositor*, May 1909.

life, but what has it to do with a collection of Christ's sayings?

Again, the document thus reconstructed contains for the most part sayings or groups of sayings. In the midst of this appears quite unexpectedly a miracle, that of *the Centurion's Servant*. What has this to do in a collection of sayings? A little later there is another miracle, the healing of a dumb demoniac before the Beelzebub discourse. But the two cases are not parallel. Q, as reconstructed by Harnack, contains several instances of a very slight narrative setting to a series of sayings; cf., for example, *the Two Aspirants*, or *the Sending of John's disciples*, or *the Demand for a Sign*. Harnack, by linking together these and one or two other such references to fact, makes up what he calls seven narrative sections, but in reality only one is a narrative section, namely, *the Centurion's Servant*; and the others, including the Beelzebub miracle, are quite different in nature, being not self-contained narratives, but mere allusions to fact which serve as an introduction to sayings or groups of sayings. The narrative of *the Centurion's Servant* is therefore really isolated in Q. And we cannot help asking what right has it to be there? The central point of the story is not Christ's saying, 'Not even in Israel have I found such faith' (for as a saying apart from its context, that has no meaning), but the *facts* that Christ could heal by a word, and that He had done such a healing for the servant of a centurion.

What has a compilation of discourses in common with a narrative section like this? Or if the compiler admitted it, then surely his book must have contained other miracles and narratives and have been of a very different character from the source as Harnack reconstructs it.

Further, Harnack puts into his source eleven instances of what he calls Parables. But just as he uses the word *narrative* to cover mere references to fact, so he here uses *parable* to cover analogies, similes, etc. Of his eleven cases only four are formal parables. They are *the Two Builders*, *the Leaven*, *the Mustard Seed*, and *the Children in the Market-Place*. The rest are metaphors or allegorical allusions. Now here is a strange thing that in a document professing to be a collection of some of Christ's sayings there should be only four parables. The inference is obvious. Harnack's reconstructed source is at least incomplete. If there really was a collection of Christ's

sayings, it must have contained more parables than these four, and those that are missing might very materially affect our judgment of the nature of the document.

Again, the reconstructed source brings with it almost as many difficulties as it solves, for it is only possible to explain the text of our two Gospels as reproductions of it by allowing the two Evangelists a freedom of dealing with it which is hard to reconcile with the probability admitted by Harnack, that it was of Apostolic origin. How explain, for example, the two presentations of the *Beatitudes*, or of the *Lord's Prayer*, on the supposition that the Evangelists had before them in an Apostolic document one and the same record of each of these items? Surely the inference here is irresistible that the differences in these sections between the two writers is not due to the fact that they are arbitrarily altering words, which they both had before them in the same form, but that they are reproducing different traditions of the Lord's words.

However, we might perhaps assent that the principle of putting into a common source all that is common to Matt. and Luke alone is not very likely to be far wrong, and that there is some probability that most of the above material occurred in a document lying behind our First and Third Gospels.

But two other words of caution are here needed. Before we proceed to discuss the character of this source and its theology we ought to be sure that we really have sufficient data for so doing. This is just where Harnack's method seems to me to break down.

For (1) we cannot be sure that the source did not contain much more than the material collected above. Either Matt. alone, or Luke alone, may contain material which belonged to it; or the source may have contained much which neither of these writers have borrowed from it.

(2) If so, this lost material, or this material found in only one Gospel, if added to that which Harnack puts into his Q, might very considerably modify our impression of its general characteristics and of its theology.

B. Results.—Now Harnack, after reconstructing his document, attempts to characterize its theology, and draws inferences from that as to its date.

There is in it no reference to the Passion. Therefore the central feature of the gospel message

was not Christ as Redeemer, but Christ as Teacher and Prophet of the Kingdom. Therefore the book was compiled before Mark wrote his Gospel, but not too early, or Mark would have used it.

Ramsay¹ tries to improve on Harnack here. He assumes that Harnack's conception of Q is right in the main, but argues that no Christian disciple could have written such a book after Christ's death, or at any rate after Pentecost. It must therefore have been composed during Christ's lifetime.

Ramsay is no doubt right that Harnack's Q is inexplicable as a production of a Christian disciple in the first thirty years after the Lord's death, but this fact should lead us, not to try and find a possible date during Christ's lifetime for the work, but to ask whether such a document as Harnack gives us ever existed at all. The inference again presses: the source must have contained much more than is given in Harnack's reconstruction, and the missing material might give quite a different character to the work, and make it an intelligible production of the early days of Christianity.

And the data exist for the discovery of the missing material. It is not far to seek, for it lies embedded in the First Gospel. Harnack gives as characteristic features of the source as reconstructed by him, 'Jewish horizon and sentiment' and 'conflict against the Pharisees.' He also says that the conception of the 'Kingdom of God' is that of a future kingdom in Mt 8¹¹=Lk 13²⁸; Mt 23¹³=Lk 11⁵²; Mt 7²¹=Lk 6⁴⁶; Mt 10⁷=Lk 9² and Mt 6³³=Lk 12³¹; whilst in four other places, namely, Mt 12²⁸=Lk 11²⁰; Mt 13^{33, 31}=Lk 13^{20, 18}; Mt 11¹¹=Lk 7²⁸; and Mt 11¹²=Lk 16¹⁶, the Kingdom is regarded as already present.

Now the exact phrases in these passages are these:

	MT.	LK.	HARNACK.
8 ¹¹	βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν	βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ	βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ
23 ¹³	βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν	otherwise	βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ
7 ²¹	" "	otherwise	" "
10 ⁷	" "	βασιλεία τῶν θεοῦ	" "
6 ³³	βασιλεία	βασιλεία αὐτοῦ	βασιλεία αὐτοῦ
12 ²⁸	βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ	βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ	βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ
13 ³³	βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν	βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ	βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ
13 ³¹	" "	" "	" "
11 ¹¹	" "	" "	" "
11 ¹²	" "	" "	" "

It will be seen that so far as these passages are

¹ *Luke the Physician*, p. 89.

concerned, Matt. eight times has βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν where Luke has βασιλ. τοῦ θεοῦ (if he has any equivalent words), while Matt. only once has βασιλ. τοῦ θεοῦ. Harnack assumes that Luke has retained the phrase of the source, while Matt. has altered it in every case save one. But it is far more probable that Matt. retains the phraseology of his source, which Harnack admits was Jewish in character, and that Luke or a previous editor of Q has substituted for the Jewish βασιλ. τῶν οὐρανῶν a phrase which would be more natural to Western ears.²

As regards Harnack's distinction between the kingdom as present and future, all the cases where Matt. has τῶν οὐρανῶν, or simply βασιλεία, probably denoted the future Kingdom, an idea which is specially characteristic of the source. If Mt 12²⁸ has τοῦ θεοῦ, that only shows that the source exceptionally used this phrase, the reason here probably being the influence of the preceding πνεύματι θεοῦ.

We find, then, amongst the characteristics of the source (a) 'Jewish horizon and sentiment'; (b) 'conflict against the Pharisees'; (c) 'the eschatological conception of the Kingdom.' Now if we apply these criteria to some of the sayings in Matt. which Harnack does not admit into his source, we shall find that they have a claim to admission there. *E.g.* 5²⁰ is anti-Pharisaic. So are 6¹⁻¹⁸ and 15¹²⁻¹⁴. The following are marked by Jewish horizon and sentiment: 6^{10b}, 'Thy will be done'; 7⁶, 'swine' = Gentiles, 10^{5b-8, 23} 15²³⁻²⁴ and 24³⁰; and the following by Jewish phraseology: 16¹⁷⁻¹⁹ 18^{14, 16-20}.

I give here only a few verses which ought to be admitted into the source, although Luke has no parallel to them. I have elsewhere tried to make a more complete list of passages which were probably in the source, and have shown how the source, when so enlarged, presents a character very different from the description which Harnack gives of his

² Here, as elsewhere, Harnack obscures the theological tendencies of the source by blotting out of it phrases which were fundamentally characteristic of it as a Jewish-Christian collection of the Messiah's sayings. *E.g.* Harnack omits ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς or ὁ οὐράνιος after πατήρ, and the first three aspirations of the Lord's Prayer. The compiler of the source writing in the early days of Jewish-Christian Church life might (probably not) have added these clauses to the traditional prayer. But it is little likely that an editor so late as 'Matt.' would here and elsewhere have judaized his material.

limited Q. (See *St. Matthew* [‘Intern. Crit.Com.’], lvii–lviii, lxxvi–lxxix.)¹ This source, as the writer of the First Gospel had it before him, was a collection of sayings and groups of sayings which had strongly marked Jewish-Christian features. It was very anti-Pharisaic, and many of the sayings were couched in very Jewish language, as, e.g., Mt 16¹⁷⁻¹⁹. Being a collection of notable sayings of Christ, it naturally represented Him mainly on the side of His teaching, i.e. as a prophet of the Kingdom of Heaven. But it identified Him with the Son of Man of whom He had spoken, and represented Him as teaching that the Kingdom would be inaugurated when, in the near future, He returned as Son of Man. The ethical teaching which the book contained was therefore understood to be intended for His disciples, who were the true Israel, during the period of expectation of His return. Other characteristics of the book were its emphasis on the belief that Christ had not abrogated the Mosaic Law, which was still binding on His disciples, and its hostility to the Pharisees. They had misused their privileges, had rejected the Messiah, and, in consequence, the inheritance of the Kingdom had passed from them to the community (ἐκκλησία) of the disciples of the Messiah, to whom many proselytes from amongst the Gentiles would attach themselves (8¹²).

The source as thus reconstructed may well be Apostolic (cf. Papias). It must be early in date, and it may well have been written in the early days of Christianity in Palestine, but certainly not during Christ’s lifetime (Ramsay).

The later history of this book of sayings is full of interest. In the first place, the editor of the First Gospel got hold of it and combined it with St. Mark. He wrote in its spirit, was influenced by its conception, and adopted its phraseology. That is why he modifies St. Mark’s record in such a way, e.g., as to make it clear that Christ had not abolished the Mosaic distinction between clean and unclean meats,² and that His teaching on divorce was not antagonistic to Deuteronomy.³ For the same reason he modifies Mk 9¹ (cf. Mt 16²⁸) in such a way as to show that the Kingdom of God will come with power when the Son of Man comes in His

Kingdom, and that this will take place within the generation of Christ’s contemporaries. The influence of the phraseology of the source upon the editor is shown, too, by the way in which he almost invariably substitutes βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν for Mark’s βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ.⁴ The Gospel which he thus composed out of Mark and the discourse source is as Jewish in horizon and sentiment, as anti-Pharisaic, as primitive in its expectation of the nearness of the Parousia as was the source. For there is nothing in the Gospel which could not be accepted by one who believed that the new Israel, to whom the Kingdom was coming when the Son of Man returned, consisted of those Jewish-Christians who believed in Him, and of Gentiles who joined themselves to them. The parables in the Gospel are all capable of interpretation eschatologically, and the verses in which there is reference to admission of Gentiles to the new society would suggest nothing more startling to a pious Jewish-Christian than many passages in the Jewish prophets.

That the Church adopted this Gospel with its Jewish atmosphere into the list of its sacred books proves, not that the editor wrote it in a Pauline spirit of universalism, but that much that he has inserted can be interpreted in a sense very different from that which he and his contemporaries gave to it. The strange thing is that modern writers should fail to recognize the Jewish and primitive atmosphere of the book, and should continue to speak of it as though it had been written by a Churchman who wished to represent Christ as having sanctioned the doctrines and usages of the Christian Church as they existed a generation or two after His lifetime.

At a somewhat later date St. Luke came across some of the contents of this discourse source. Harnack and others write as though he had before him the original book in the same form in which the editor of the First Gospel used it. But this is very unlikely. The supposition that Matt. and Luke both used substantially the same discourse document forces us to suppose that Luke has used great freedom in editing it, altering its phraseology, and breaking up its groups of sayings. And it is unlikely that he would have so treated a primitive and perhaps apostolic work. It would be easier to think that he had seen our First Gospel and sometimes been influenced by it. In that

¹ I have ready for immediate publication a full text of the source reconstructed on the lines laid down in this paper.

² Mt 15²⁰, Mk 7¹⁹. Cf. *St. Matthew*, p. 167, n.

³ Mt 19⁹, Mk 10¹¹.

⁴ Cf. *St. Matthew*, p. lxvii.

case the First Gospel was one of the 'many' secondary gospel writings to which he refers in his Prologue.

On the other hand, the view, that whilst Matt. had a Greek translation of the original book, Luke knew some of its contents, not directly but inter-

mediately, scattered through some of the works to which he refers in his preface, explains both the large amount of agreement between Matt. and Luke in sayings of Christ, and at the same time their disagreement in the phraseology, order, and setting of these sayings.

In the Study.

Was St. Peter ever in Rome?

THE report of Monsignor Duchesne's great scholarship has penetrated even to this country, and the translation of his *Early History of the Christian Church* (Murray; 9s. net), which has been made from the fourth edition of that work, will find a welcome. It is true that his name is more associated with the history of Church institutions. But it would be strange if the historian of Church institutions were incapable of writing a history of the Church. Certainly the history of the early Church can be written only by one who is intimately acquainted with its institutions.

The distinctive features of Mgr. Duchesne's History are simplicity of style, simplicity of purpose, and conscientious painstaking research. In some parts of the work every page testifies to the abundance of discovery in recent years of early Church literature and to Mgr. Duchesne's acquaintance with it. The period covered is from the Burning of Rome in 64 A.D. to the end of the third century. But there are four chapters of preparation, summarizing the history of events recorded in the New Testament.

Mgr. Duchesne's simplicity of purpose may be tested by his handling of the question whether St. Peter was ever in Rome. It is a question which Roman Catholics answer with a unanimous Yes. Mgr. Duchesne answers Yes. It is even possible that he would be distressed if he were told that his evidence left it open to Protestants to answer No. But he is not the man to twist the evidence in order to secure a verdict. What does it amount to?

In the first place, there is no information whatever as to anything St. Peter did in Rome. All that even tradition affirms is that in Rome he died

and left his chair. Mgr. Duchesne makes nothing of possible references in the Apocalypse or the Epistle to the Hebrews; and of the last chapter of the Fourth Gospel he says merely that it contains an extremely clear allusion to the way in which St. Peter met his death. In the first Epistle which bears his name a greeting is sent from the Church of Babylon, which Mgr. Duchesne has no doubt is the Church of Rome. But he is not sure that St. Peter wrote that First Epistle. He is sure, however, that the author, writing under Peter's name, would only write from a place where it was known Peter had stayed.

Outside the New Testament he comes first to Clement of Rome, who in his reference to Nero's persecution (1 Clem. 5, 6) connects Peter and Paul with the Danaïdes, the Dirces, and other victims who suffered as a result of the burning of Rome. There is Ignatius also, but his reference is quite indefinite. 'I do not command you,' he says to the Roman Christians, 'as Peter and Paul did: they were apostles, I am only a condemned criminal.' Upon which Mgr. Duchesne remarks, rather curiously for him: 'These words do not amount to the assertion, "Peter came to Rome," but supposing he did come, Ignatius would not have spoken otherwise; whereas if he had not, there would have been no point in Ignatius' argument.'

We have to go on now beyond the middle of the second century. And what we find is that St. Peter's visit to Rome is then an accepted fact. Dionysius of Corinth in Greece, Irenæus in Gaul, Clement and Origen in Alexandria, and Tertullian in Africa, all refer to it. In Rome itself, Caius, about 200 A.D., points out the tombs of St. Peter and St. Paul. 'By the third century, we find the Popes building on their title of successors of St.

Peter, and their right to the title is nowhere denied.'

That is the evidence.

Sun, Stand Thou Still.

That great question, how far the Septuagint and other early versions should be used for the translation of the Old Testament, which is touched upon in the 'Notes of Recent Exposition,' is discussed by Professor Geden in his *Introduction to the Hebrew Bible* (T. & T. Clark; 8s. 6d. net). More than that, in a lucid account of the versions themselves, Professor Geden enables English readers to take an interest in the matter, and even to give their opinion with some little confidence. He also discusses some of the passages which are affected by the readings of the versions.

One of these passages is that popular crux of interpretation, the standing still of the sun in Jos 10^{12, 13}. The Hebrew which is translated 'stand thou still' is literally 'be dumb.' And Dr. Geden has little doubt that the reference is to 'an eclipse of the sun, vividly and picturesquely represented as its *dumbness*, the occurrence of which struck terror into the hearts of Israel's enemies, and contributed mainly to their overthrow.'

The whole passage in the Revised Version is:

Sun, stand thou still upon Gibeon;
And thou, Moon, in the valley of Aijalon.
And the sun stood still, and the moon stayed,
Until the nation had avenged themselves of their enemies.

Professor Geden believes that the last line is a mistranslation. He thinks that the verb had originally been the same as in the first line. (In the present Hebrew there is only the difference of a letter between them.) Then the meaning would be 'and the sun stood still, and the moon stayed, until the nations their enemies became dumb (or were destroyed).' The Septuagint gives the glory directly to God (ἕως ἡμῶν ὁ θεὸς τοὺς ἐχθροὺς αὐτῶν), showing that there is at least room for reconsideration of the Hebrew.

Before the City.

The Sheriff of Perthshire is a student of the New Testament. He has written a volume on *St. Paul and his Mission to the Roman Empire* (R. & R. Clark; 1s. 6d.). He has written it as

a layman should, without theological discussion or didactic meditation, simply as a story of human interest. And once or twice he takes his own view of things and even his own exegesis.

He takes his own exegesis of Ac 14¹³: 'Then the priest of Jupiter, which was before their city, brought oxen and garlands unto the gates, and would have done sacrifice with the people.' What is meant by 'which was before their city'? The R.V., with most of the expositors, makes it 'whose temple was before the city.' Sheriff Johnston says: 'The expression "Jupiter before the city," so puzzling to the ordinary reader, means Jupiter whose worship was established here before the city was built.'

The Hope that is in You.

MATERIALS FOR THE STUDY OF
1 PETER III. 15.

'But sanctify the Lord God in your hearts: and be ready always to give an answer to every man that asketh you a reason of the hope that is in you with meekness and fear.'

I. THE MEANING.

Sanctify.—What is meant by sanctifying God (or Christ)? The expression occurs also in the Lord's Prayer (Mt 6⁹, Lk 11²), where the same verb is used of *hallowing* the name of God. The idea is found nowhere else in the New Testament, but in the O.T. it occurs in Lv 10³, Nu 20¹², Is 29²³, Ezk 36²³ 38²³. Just as to 'glorify' God means (in word and deed) to recognize His glorious perfections; as to 'magnify' Him means to recognize His greatness; as to 'justify' Him means to recognize His inherent justice; so to 'sanctify' Him means to recognize, in word and deed, His full holiness, and therefore to treat Him with due awe. This not only substitutes the fear of God for the fear of man (since they mutually exclude each other), but also enforces purity of life.¹

It is the simplest of truisms that God can receive no increase of holiness, least of all from those who must beg Him to forgive their sins; but to sanctify Him, or to hallow His Name, is to acknowledge Him, not merely in word, but habitually and practically—in thought, in feeling, in aim, in conduct—as being what He is, the

¹ Mason, in Ellicott's *N. T. Commentary*.

one supreme object of obedience, reverence, and devotion. They sanctify Him who give Him His due, who treat His claims as real and absolute, who look away from all other powers, from all imagined resources or grounds of confidence, to Him as the origin and centre of their existence, the One most high, most holy, and most lovable, and at the same time most 'awful' in His 'purity,' with a reverential awe which leaves no room for lower fear, because it involves an adoring and loving trust.¹

The Lord God.—The A.V. follows the Textus Receptus (Κύριον δὲ τὸν Θεόν), but the evidence is overwhelming for Χριστὸν instead of Θεόν, and all the editors adopt it. But what is the translation? Wyclif, following the Vulgate (Dominum Christum), has simply 'the Lord Christ,' and Rheims 'our² Lord Christ.' R.V. has 'Christ as Lord,' making Κύριον without the article as the predicate of the sentence. But Bigg points out that the sentence is a quotation from the Septuagint of Isaiah (8¹³), where the Κύριον is already without the article. He accordingly translates, 'sanctify the Lord, that is to say, the Christ.' The commentators mostly agree with Bigg. Mason translates 'sanctify the Lord the Christ'; Plumptre and Bennett more briefly 'the Lord Christ.' In any case, as Bigg says, 'the Christological import of the passage is not affected.' The Κύριον of the Septuagint corresponds to the 'Yahweh of Hosts' of the Hebrew, and the application of the name to Christ here amounts to a claim to Divine honour for Him.³

How significant is the application to Christ, by His own "first" Apostle, of words which the prophet had used with reference to the Holy One of Israel! If Christ can be, and is to be, thus sanctified, Christ must be literally Divine, One in being with the Most High; or else St. Peter is in effect exhorting us to break the first commandment.⁴

In your hearts.—This does not mean simply 'with your hearts,' or 'from your hearts' (i.e. inwardly, or, with all sincerity and devotion), but it signifies the local habitation where the Christ is to be thus recognized. That is to say: St.

Peter, like St. Paul (Eph 3¹⁷), acknowledges an *indwelling* of Christ in the hearts of the faithful; and this indwelling is not merely subjective, consisting of their constant recollection of Him, but real and objective: there He is, as in a shrine, and they must pay due reverence to His presence. The Apostle does, in fact, in those words 'in your hearts,' purposely call attention to the difference between Isaiah's use of the name Immanuel and the Christian meaning of it. To Isaiah, God dwelt in the midst of a people in its corporate capacity; St. Peter knew that, through the Incarnation, each individual Christian has God in him, united with him.⁵

And be ready.—R.V. 'being ready.' The evidence for the omission of 'and' is decisive. But there is no word in the Greek for 'be' or 'being,' and the insertion of any such word obscures the close connexion with the preceding injunction. The first effect of the abiding sense of Christ present as the object of holy fear in the heart will be a constant readiness to meet inquirers.⁶

Always.—At a moment's notice, emphasized afterwards by 'to every man that asketh you.'

To give an answer.—Gr. πρὸς ἀπολογία, lit. 'for apology,' R.V. 'to give answer.' 'To give an answer' is Tindale's translation, followed by all the English Versions, except Wyclif ('to do satisfaccioun'); Purvey, 'to satisfaccioun' and Rheims ('to satisfie') who follow the Vulgate *ad satisfactionem*. Of the modern versions Weymouth⁷ has 'to make your defence.' This is the meaning. The answer or apology is strictly a speech made by a prisoner in his defence, and so used of Paul's speech to the hostile Jewish mob at Jerusalem, Ac 22¹; also Ac 25¹⁶ (R.V., 'defence'); and of Paul's defence when tried at Rome, 2 Ti 4¹⁶. So Plato's *Apology* is in the form of a speech made by Socrates in his defence when tried for his life. Later on *Apologia* came to be the title of treatises written in defence of the Christian faith. Hence the science of Christian evidences is styled 'Apologetics.' This verse might serve for its motto.⁸

To every man that asketh you a reason.—Cook, 'to any one who asks for an account.' And Mason

¹ W. Bright, *Morality in Doctrine*, p. 306.

² 'Our' is a mistake, and is changed in Haydock's Version and in all modern Catholic Bibles into 'the.'

³ Masterman, *First Epistle of St. Peter*.

⁴ W. Bright, *Morality in Doctrine*, p. 309.

⁵ Mason, in Ellicott's *N.T. Commentary*.

⁶ Cook, in the *Speaker's Commentary*.

⁷ *The N.T. in Modern Speech*.

⁸ Bennett, in *The Century Bible*.

properly points out that 'ask' is equivalent to demand. It does not mean inquirers about Christian doctrine, but those who call Christians to account for their profession of the gospel hope. Mason thinks that St. Peter refers chiefly to being called into the law court to give account, and that he is probably thinking of our Lord's charge in Lk 12¹¹. Cook points out that the Greek words for 'answer' (ἀπολογία) and 'reason' (λόγος) are closely related. Lyman Abbott would bring the relation out by translating, 'Be always ready to give a justification to those who ask you to justify the hope that is in you,' or, 'to show a reasonableness of the hope that is in you to those that ask you a reason for it.'¹

Of.—'Of' is here used in the obsolete sense of 'about,' or 'concerning' (R.V.). The same prep. (περί) is translated 'of,' with the same meaning in Ac 5²⁴, 'they doubted of them, whereunto this would grow'; 15⁶, 'the apostles and the elders were gathered together to consider of this matter'; 1 Co 11¹, 'It hath been declared unto me of you.' Cf. the Rhemish translation of Mt 11⁷, 'Jesus began to say to the multitudes of John.'² The three chief modern versions (Weymouth, Twentieth Century, Lloyd) prefer 'for,' which goes better with 'reason.' But we can still say 'an account of the hope.'

The hope that is in you.—Mason takes the hope to be simply Christianity, but Bennett,³ more particularly, the expectation of the glorification of Christ, of deliverance from sin and suffering, and of admission to the perfect bliss of intimate fellowship with God; an expectation that took shape for a time in the picturesque imagery of an immediate second coming, but was more worthily realized in the future life. To outsiders, the Christian hope was at once the most attractive and the most absurd feature of the faith, and would therefore be a frequent subject of inquiry.

With meekness and fear.—A.V., following the Textus Receptus, omits 'but,' which is found in all the best MSS and ancient versions. Of two Greek words so rendered it is the more forcible that is used here (ἀλλά), R.V. 'yet.' Masterman paraphrases, 'but remember.' Meekness in relation to man, fear in relation to God. Meekness is the opposite of assertiveness. In Tit 3² it

is set over against a contentious spirit, in Gal 6¹ against want of consideration for offenders, in 2 Ti 2²⁴ against harshness towards opponents. The fear, says Bishop Butler, is that reverential fear which the nature of religion requires and which is so far from being inconsistent with, that it will inspire, proper courage towards men.

II. THE USE.

I. CHRISTIANITY AS A RELIGION OF HOPE. Our apologia is always an account of the *hope* that is in us. It differs in this respect from all other religions. The religion of Confucius is a religion of memory and duty; the Confucianists reverence, if they do not worship, the memory of their ancestors, and attempt to walk in the same path; but there is no light shining on that path from the future world, and there is no hand stretched out to help and to sustain them from the upper world. The religion of Buddha is a religion of duty; but it is also a religion, if not of despair, of at least a close approximation to despair. Its only message to mankind is that there is no escape from the evil of the world except by escape from consciousness, by extinction; and there is no extinction except by the way of duty. That is not a very hopeful religion. And the religion of the old Stoics, the best of all the religions of ancient Greece and Rome, had in it no hope. It was a religion of courage; a religion of obligation; but the best that the Stoic could say was—'Endure bravely.' He threw no light on the problems of the future. Now and then a glimmer of light shines from ancient philosophy, as in the writings of Socrates; but, for the most part, the religions of paganism, though they may be religions of reverence and of duty and of fidelity and of conscience, are not religions of faith [or of hope].⁴

Not many weeks ago I was walking in New York with a brilliant Japanese friend. It was evening, and the moon was shining brightly. My friend called my attention to the fact that in the poetry of Buddhism, the literature of Buddhism, there is almost no reference to the sun, but always to the moon, and he explained the fact by pointing out that the spirit of Buddhism is essentially that of pessimism and sadness, and that naturally the cold, calm moon would be used in literature as a characteristic symbol. On the other hand, he called attention to the almost constant use of the sun as a symbol in Christian literature, and accounted for it by the fact that the inherent spirit of

¹ *Christian World Pulpit*, xxxviii. p. 200.

² *D.B.* iii. 585.

³ *The Century Bible*.

⁴ Lyman Abbott, in *Christian World Pulpit*, xxxviii. 200.

'Christianity is that of hopefulness, energy, and courage, and the sun is the natural symbol of such ideas.¹

1. The Bible is a book of Hope. It never ignores the dark facts of man's history; but it never passes from the description of any of them without hinting at the hope and the promise of a remedy. The story of the Fall has the ray of hope which we call the Protevangelium thrown upon it (Gn 3¹⁵). The flood is followed by the Rainbow promise. Even after the crucifixion the disciples met together in an upper room and were glad. Again and again in the Epistles we come upon some rapturous outburst of hope, until it finds its glorious consummation in the Book of Revelation, and all the Universe rings with the Hallelujah Chorus.²

2. Our God is a God of hope. This is St. Paul's deliberate description of Him (Ro 15¹³). He means that He is the God of hope for man. And yet He knows what is in man.

O Lord, when Thou didst call me, didst Thou know

My heart disheartened thro' and thro',
Still hankering after Egypt full in view,
Where cucumbers and melons grow?

—'Yea, I knew.'—

But, Lord, when Thou didst choose me, didst Thou know

How marred I was and withered too,
Nor rose for sweetness nor for virtue rue,
Timid and rash, hasty and slow?

—'Yea, I knew.'—

My Lord, when Thou didst love me, didst Thou know

How weak my efforts were, how few,
Tepid to love and impotent to do,
Envious to reap while slack to sow?

—'Yea, I knew.'—

Good Lord, Who knowest what I cannot know,

And dare not know, my false, my true,
My new, my old; Good Lord, arise and do,
If loving Thou hast known me so.

—'Yea, I knew.'³

3. The Unspeakable Gift was a gift to hope. 'The Son of Man is come to seek and to save that which was lost.' Nor is He unaware of the task. He sees a Zacchæus through and through, and He says, 'To-day is salvation come to this house.'

A policeman said to me one day, 'It is a very easy thing for you to have faith in folks, sir; but it is very hard for me.' 'Why so, my friend?' I asked. 'Well,' said he, 'you see

the best of folks and you see them at their best: you see them because they are good. But I see folks because they are bad. And when you see nothing but badness it is hard to have any faith in any goodness anywhere.' I sympathized deeply with that man and with thousands who are in like evil case. *It is hard.* But this triumphant hope of Jesus Christ is the hope of One Whose life and work is in relation to sin.⁴

He knows the worth of man as well as his want.

How can we bridge over those gulfs of social differences which sever us from one another, and which seem ever to grow deeper and wider? Alas, to-day it is in this world that Dives and Lazarus are hopelessly shut off from one another. To-day Lazarus cannot reach the rich man's gate—it is too far out in the suburbs; and as for the dogs, they are a great deal too delicately cared for to show the beggar any such delicate attention as that which is recorded concerning those of olden time. It is only in one way that deliverance can come—it is by making the man greater than his position, greater than all his surroundings, that you can bridge these gulfs—thus and thus only. Do we not all remember the words, true, alas! to-day as when they were written?—

But why do I talk of death?

That phantom of grisly bone:

I hardly fear his terrible shape,

It seems so like my own.

It seems so like my own

Because of the fasts I keep:

O God! that bread should be so dear!

And flesh and blood so cheap!

Jesus Christ alone has made man worth more than gain or pleasure: and Jesus Christ alone can keep man so.⁵

And He goes to work by the way of hope. 'He shall not cry nor lift up, nor cause his voice to be heard in the street. A bruised reed shall he not break, and the smoking flax shall he not quench.'—'Woman, where are thine accusers? Hath no man condemned thee? She said, No man, Lord. And Jesus said, Neither do I condemn thee: go thy way; from henceforth sin no more' (Jn 8^{10, 11}).

As Napoleon was conversing with his officers one day about the great men of antiquity, he turned to one of his suite and asked him: 'Can you tell me who Jesus Christ was?' The officer replied that he had not thought much of those things. 'Well,' said Napoleon, 'I will tell you. I think I understand something of human nature, and I tell you that the heroes of antiquity were men, and I am a man. Alexander, Cæsar, Charlemagne, and myself founded great empires; and upon what did the creations of our genius depend? Upon force. Jesus alone founded His empire upon love, and to-day millions would die for Him.'⁶

¹ Cuthbert Hall, in *Christian World Pulpit*, lxi. 348.

² See M. G. Pearse, *Short Talks for the Times*, p. 209.

³ Christina G. Rossetti.

⁴ M. G. Pearse, *Short Talks for the Times*, p. 218.

⁵ *Ibid.* p. 220.

⁶ *Ibid.* p. 223.

2. HOW DO WE MAKE THIS CHRISTIAN HOPE OURS? By sanctifying the Lord Christ in our hearts. In the beginning of the Epistle, St. Peter tells us that we have been begotten 'unto a living hope by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead' (1 P 1⁸). Whereupon he adds a practical 'wherefore.' 'Wherefore,' he says, 'gird up the loins of your mind, be sober, and hope to the end for the grace that is to be brought unto you at the revelation of Jesus Christ' (1¹³). And this hope is to take the form of holiness, 'Because it is written, Ye shall be holy; because I am holy' (1¹⁶). For the Christian hope, which springs from the resurrection of Christ, becomes ours by the revelation of Christ in our hearts. Now in this revelation we recognize the holiness of Christ, and we ourselves are made holy. Our hearts become fit temples for Christ to dwell in.

We have all of us, I dare say, witnessed the consecration of a church. We have seen the fabric growing from its foundation. We have seen the first stone laid with much ceremony, amidst many hopes and with many prayers. We have passed the place daily, or visited it from time to time, in the interval between that laying of the first stone, which was the dedication of the ground, and that solemn act of inauguration which was the consecration of the finished building. We have seen the walls rise, the arches gradually spring upwards, the roof framed and at last covered, the windows carefully shaped and then filled perhaps with bright colours. All this time the workmen busied themselves within, as they might have done in the construction of a common dwelling. No one thought it irreverent to enter with his head covered: the time for such scruples was not yet. At last the day of consecration arrived. A religious service, of unusual ceremony and devotion, set apart the building for ever to the sole use of God's worshippers, and invoked the perpetual blessing of God Himself upon all who should there assemble in that character to the end of time.¹

But when Christ comes to dwell in the heart He turns the temple into a sanctuary, a place of refuge. It becomes a sanctuary (1) against apprehended suffering; (2) against persecution; (3) against fear for the future of the Church and the faith.

Let us observe how impressively the Apostle adopts the language of the prophet, who had to cheer up faithful souls in Judah against the time when the waters, as he expressed it, of 'the great Assyrian river' were to spread like a flood over the land of the promised 'Immanuel.' What would then be the only refuge? The truth of which Immanuel's name was the condensation: 'With us is God.' It is not for His servants to be scared by what terrifies the worldly-minded and unfaithful. They must not be shaken like trees under the wind; such fear is for a king and a people who

are 'wearing out' the forbearance of their God. No, 'fear not ye what this people fear. The Lord of Hosts, Him shall ye sanctify; let Him be the one object of your fear, let Him be your "living Dread." Yes, fear to offend Him, and fear nothing else; and then He will be to you for a place of shelter, a sanctuary where you can be safe and at rest, 'hidden from the provoking of all men.' This is the point, that the 'one most holy and saving fear of His displeasure delivers us from all base and earthly fear, from all other fear in the world.' This is why, in other places of Scripture, the fear of man is described as a snare, and worldly fearfulness as a sin, implying as it does that the fear of the Lord is absent. The son of Sirach's 'woe to fearful hearts' is reaffirmed in the Apocalypse, which places 'the fearful' first in the list of the inevitably condemned.²

3. THE CHRISTIAN HOPE IS A HOPE FOR THE CHRISTIAN, AND IT IS A HOPE FOR THE WORLD.

1. For the Christian. It carries him back to the creation. The creation of a soul involves immense obligations on the part of the Creator. Accordingly it is the Creator Himself that becomes the Redeemer. And He may be trusted to fulfil in the Christian soul the promise of His first word. He abideth faithful; He cannot deny Himself. The tree of life in the midst of the first Paradise would mock God, as it stands in the first Book of the Bible, if it were not found again in the last Book. 'To him that overcometh will I give to eat of the tree of life which is in the Paradise of God' (Rev 27).³

I pluck an acorn from the greensward, and I hold it to my ear; and this is what it says to me: 'By and by the birds will nest in me; by and by I will furnish shade for the cattle; by and by I will furnish warmth for the home in the pleasant fire; by and by I will be shelter from the storm to those that have gone under the roof; by and by I will be the great ribs of the great vessel, and the tempest will beat against me in vain while I carry men across the Atlantic.' 'O foolish little acorn! wilt thou be all this?' And the acorn says, 'Yes, God and I.' And so I look out into life, into history, into the story of Christ, and He says to me, 'You are to become a son of God.' And I say, 'I?' 'Yes,' He says, 'you, when I am within you, and you are working out My design and accomplishing My purpose.'⁴

2. For the world. (1) Because the God of hope is a God of love, of love for the world. And (2) because of the actual progress in the world which the gospel of hope has made.

4. WE ARE TO BE READY ALWAYS TO GIVE AN ACCOUNT OF THIS HOPE.

1. An answer is always possible. For (1) the

² W. Bright, *Morality in Doctrine*, p. 305.

³ See J. Newton, *The Problem of Personality*, p. 235.

⁴ Lyman Abbott, in *Christian World Pulpit*, xxxviii. 201.

¹ C. J. Vaughan, *Epiphany, Lent, and Easter*, p. 349.

Christian hope is not the suppression of reason. Momerie reminds us that even so wise a man as Bacon was once foolish enough to say, 'The more incredible anything is, the more honour I do God in believing it.' (2) Nor is our hope contrary to reason. It may contain much that the reason cannot comprehend, but in so far as it is true it can contain nothing that is positively contradicted by the reason. Accordingly (3) the revelation in the heart which follows the resurrection, although it is Divine and Supernatural, appeals to the reason and calls for its exercise. And (4) the Object of worship must be a reasonable Object.¹

2. An answer is a good thing. It yields two benefits. (1) It makes our convictions respected. There is persuasion in the forceful putting of a thought. The effect of words, as of soldiers, can be trebled by their manner of marshalling. And (2) it gives ourselves a firmer grasp of the hope. Our hope becomes resolute when we know with precision what it is and with definiteness why it is. If we are crossing a stream upon a bridge we contemplate with pleasure the broad courses of masonry on which it rests.²

There was an island, so runs the fable, in which it was reported that there was buried much gold. Many came and upturned the stones, and, though they never found the gold for which they looked, yet their searching for it prepared a barren soil for the reception of the seeds which the winds and the birds brought, and at last the hidden treasure appeared in olives and grapes. It is in the same way that the Bible and religion are understood to-day as they could not have been if the rationalistic critics of Germany had not worked. Though the Tübingen school have not succeeded in finding the explanation of Christianity for which they sought, they have succeeded in making a great historical field fruitful. Historical faith is to-day greatly indebted to historical scepticism.³

5. THE ANSWER MUST BE APPROPRIATE TO THE OCCASION. The modern answer must direct itself chiefly against the misuse of science. And it should consist of both attack and defence.

1. The attack. There are several points to which the attack may be directed.

(1) Science, even if it were infallible within its own sphere, leaves much unexplained. (a) About Nature. Science has to do with things as they are. She knows not how they came to be. That

is beyond her scope. And if you say God made them, she has no data even for a contradiction. Faith and hope say, 'Who knoweth not in all these that the hand of the Lord hath wrought this.' And if the supernatural is admitted at the beginning it must be admitted all through. (b) About man. Two things distinguish man from the rest of creation. He can think of God, and he can choose right or wrong. Science can only register the results of these gifts, she cannot account for them. And a science which suppresses what it cannot classify will not long command respect.⁴

(2) Faith in a personal God is more reasonable than materialism. A telegram is not due to the accidental arrangement of particles of matter. It requires machinery. And more wonderful than the machinery is the mind that planned it all. 'The materialistic position,' said Professor Huxley once, 'that there is nothing in the world but matter, force and necessity, is as utterly devoid of justification as the most baseless of theological dogmas.' And Clerk Maxwell said that he had carefully scrutinized all the agnostic hypotheses he knew of, and that they one and all needed a God to make them workable.⁵

(3) Science is here divided against itself. Haeckel and his followers are not the only scientists in the world. Haeckel himself tells us that Wundt is one of the ablest living psychologists in Germany. Yet Wundt abandoned the materialistic position after starting from it. Romanes, the author of *A Candid Examination of Theism* lived to write *Thoughts on Religion*.⁶

(4) Faith leads to nobler service. 'I have never yet,' says Mr. Vine, 'discovered a man who has been saved from moral degradation of any kind by materialistic teaching'; but he adds, 'It would be possible to crowd this great church with those who in this district would without hesitation affirm that the gospel of the grace of God has lifted and saved them.'⁶

2. The defence. There are many arguments.

(1) Man by his nature needs a religion of some kind.

The historian of the French Revolution of ninety years ago describes how, at a certain point in its mad career—when

¹ See A. W. Momerie, *Defects of Modern Christianity*, p. 324.

² See C. H. Parkhurst, *The Blind Man's Creed*, p. 30.

³ E. J. Hardy, *Doubt and Faith*, p. 22.

⁴ See Archbishop Thomson, *Life in the Light of God's Word*, p. 265.

⁵ See C. H. Vine, in *Christian World Pulpit*, lxxi. 7.

⁶ *Ibid.*, lxxi. 7.

all had been done that could by force be done to abolish Christianity; when the churches had been desecrated, and the priests massacred or expelled or driven into hiding—it occurred to the leaders that society could not go on without some kind of religion; and so they proceeded to persuade the National Convention to ‘decree’ (imagine that!) ‘the existence of the Supreme Being,’ and ‘the consolatory principle of the immortality of the soul,’ as ‘the basis of rational Republican Religion.’¹

(2) It must be a religion that recognizes the deepest fact of man’s being, his sense of guilt, and that endeavours to remove it.

(3) Christianity alone offers pardon and peace with sufficient means of bestowing them.

(4) Christianity alone gives power to stand.

(5) Christianity alone presents the encouragement of example, the example of One who was tempted in all points like as we are, yet without sin.²

6. THE CHRISTIAN ANSWER MUST BE MADE IN

¹ D. J. Vaughan, *Questions of the Day*, p. 177.

² See R. Leitch, *The Light of the Gentiles*, p. 146.

MEEKNESS AND IN FEAR. For (1) no answer is better than a bad answer; (2) an arrogant answer is bad; and (3) an irreverent answer is bad. That is to say, the Christian must fit himself for making his answer by knowing what his hope is, by having sufficient sympathy with man to make his answer acceptable, and by sufficient fear of God to make it true.

Bishop Blomfield used to tell a story of his having been once, late in life, at the University church at Cambridge, and of having seen a verger there whom he remembered when he was himself an undergraduate. The bishop said he was glad to see him looking so well at such a great age. ‘Oh yes, my lord,’ the man said, ‘I have much to be grateful for. I have heard every sermon which has been preached in this church for fifty years, and, thank God, I am a Christian still!’ Some of us Christianity repels rather than convinces when ‘put into a form that could be written out at examinations, or cross-examined in a court of law. After all the title is more than the title-deeds, and it is when we pierce beneath the surface that we get personal conviction and not the mere external authority of history or literature.’³

³ E. J. Hardy, *Doubt and Faith*, p. 30.

Recent Biblical Archaeology.

By STEPHEN LANGDON, M.A., Ph.D., Oxford.

Letters to Cassite Kings.⁴

THIS series contains two previous volumes of texts from the Cassite period, namely, vols. xiv. and xv., by Professor Clay, which include contracts, receipts, inventories of public property, lists of salaries for public officials, and various transactions of the state accountants. Fortunately, nearly all of the 300 documents published by Clay could be dated. Clay’s contributions to the history of this period enable one to restore the great line of Cassite kings who succeeded *Burnaburiaš* as follows, *Kurigalzu*, *Nazi-maruttaš*, *Kadašman-Turgu*, *Kadašman-Enlil*, *Kudur-Enlil*, *Šagaraktišuriaš*, *Kaštiliašu*. Evidently serious troubles overtook the Babylonian state at the end of this period, for, so far as the archives of Nippur are concerned, Cassite documents cease to be found. Nabuna’id

(555–538) found the dedicatory cylinders of only two Cassite kings whose architectural works had survived, and both of these, *Burnaburiaš* and *Šagaraktišuriaš*,⁵ belong to the portion of the dynasty restored to us by the brilliant work of Clay. The Cassite dynasty numbered thirty-six rulers, who reigned, according to the Kings’ List, 576 years, of which the archives of Nippur and the accidental records of Nabuna’id mention but these eight as of great importance. One of them, *Burnaburiaš*, was already a familiar figure in history, being made famous by his letter to Amenophis III (?) of Egypt.

Dr. Radau now publishes 99 letters (some merely fragments) from the same period. Although such documents are never dated, yet it is *a priori* probable that, being from the same archives as the

⁴ *Letters to Cassite Kings*, by Hugo Radau, Babylonian Expedition of the University of Pennsylvania, Series A, vol. xvii. part 1.

⁵ *Burnaburiaš* rebuilt Ebarra of Larsa and *Šagaraktišuriaš* Eulmaš of Sippar.

texts published by Clay, they belong to the same period, when the affairs of the Cassite dynasty were prosperous. Moreover, many prominent officials in the business records appear as writers or recipients of letters in these new texts. We may therefore concede at once the main point at issue and assign the entire series to the period from *Burnaburiaš* to *Kaštiliaš*, or about 136 years. Radau, building upon the chronological notices of Nabuna'id dates this period 1450-1309, which is a half-century earlier than the dates assigned by Thureau-Dangin, Schnabel, Weisbach, Peiser, and others. The problem of Cassite chronology is notoriously complicated by contemporaneous Egyptian and Assyrian references, as well as by conflicting statements of the Babylonian records.¹ Radau starts with the now generally conceded date of Berosus for Hammurabi, 2130 B.C., and reckons 700 years to the end of the reign of Burnaburiaš, according to the Larsa cylinder of Nabuna'id, thus obtaining about 1423 (Radau) for the end of the reign of Burnaburiaš. Hilprecht has found a tablet from the 27th year of this (?) king which would fix his year of accession at 1450. Radau maintains, against the explicit statement of the Synchronous History, that Karaindaš reigned *after* Burnaburiaš, and that Kurigalzu, whom the Nippur archives (*ex silentio*) and the Synchronous History make the son² and direct successor of Burnaburiaš, was the son of Karaindaš. Karahardaš, son of *Muballitāt-Serua* in the Synchronous History, he identifies with Kadašmanharbe, son of the same in Chronicle P. This identification I accept, and would reservedly admit the comparative accuracy of Nabuna'id.³ Following Radau also in the statement of the Sippar cylinder of Nabuna'id, who places Šagaraktišuriaš 800 years before his reconstruction of Eulmaš, and reckoning from about 540, one obtains 1340 for the approximate date of the accession of this king, making his date

¹ Schnabel's discussion in *M. V. G.*, 1908, I, 'Studien zur babyl.-assyrl. Chronologie,' appears to be wilfully subjective and often based upon absolute misstatements. For example, the Synchronous History does not say that Ašurballit revenged the murder of Karaindaš, but simply that he revenged him (p. 14).

² Radau explains *maru* as 'descendant,' which is of course possible.

³ I cannot accept Radau's reconstruction of the relationship of these kings. Following the Synchronous History I would give the dynasty thus: *Karaindaš*—1455; *Burnaburiaš* (brother of K.), 1455-1430; *Karahardaš* (son of K.), slain by the Cassites; *Kurigalzu* (son of B.), 1430-1405.

1340-1327 [Radau, 1331-1318]. I am inclined to accept this reconstruction with our author.

The letters fall into two classes, (a) those bearing the address *ana bēli-ia*, 'to my lord,' and (b) letters addressed to officials named in the letter. Naturally, a very important question is propounded by the address 'to my lord.' Does this mean the king? If so, why should the royal correspondence be found at Nippur? To be sure, we knew already from the business documents that a large portion of them concerned the *ekal* and the *bitānu* which Clay had identified with the temple. Radau is clearly right in maintaining that *ekal* means 'palace,' 'royal residence' and both he and Clay are equally wrong in regard to *bitānu*; Clay translated 'our house,' and Radau propounded the impossible explanation *é-a-nu*, 'temple of Anu'; both, however, find a reference to the temple. *E-a-nu*, *E-nu* is certainly the Hebrew בֵּיתָן, 'palace,' and a synonym of *ekallu*.⁴ The author has brought convincing internal evidence that these letters [1-74] were addressed to the king, one of which actually begins with an honorific hymn, 'To my lord adorned in befitting splendour, offspring of God, who seeketh not punishment, hero,⁵ strong and wise, etc.'⁶ One, in fact, is written by a king, whom Radau identifies with Šagaraktišuriaš. We can, therefore, entirely agree with the author on this point. He has proven beyond any doubt that Nippur was a favourite seat of the Cassite dynasty, and it is probably due to their cultivated taste that such an important literary collection was found there, just as the great library of Nineveh is due to the good taste of the famous Ašurbanipal, whose scribes copied many tablets at Nippur.

The author indulges, however, in what seems to me some impossible conjectures, and uses a passage of the Chronicle P (p. 75) to prove that *Kurigalzu's* chief residence was not Babylon, but Nippur.⁷ In

⁴ Clay finds occasional reference to a *bēt ilī*, which is of course the temple, but Radau's texts contain reference to the *ekallu* and *bitānu* only. 'Temple Archives,' a term applied by Hilprecht, Clay, and Radau to the mound whence came most of their finds, is probably false, and to be replaced by 'Palace Archives.' *ekallu* is occasionally used for 'temple' in the royal inscriptions of the late period; cf. R. i. 51, No. 1, col. I. 15.

⁵ Read *ḫarradi* not *guradi*, also *zeru ša ili* in l. 1, scarcely *zēru ištu šamē*.

⁶ No. 24.

⁷ In this connexion be it openly stated that Delitzsch's copy of Ch. P, iii. 9, does not warrant in any way the ingenious transliteration on p. 75, n. 1.

the remarkable letter, No. 24, the king's father is called *Nazi-Enlil*. Radau identifies him with *Nazibugaš*, the usurper slain by Ašur-uballit, and makes the king of No. 24 a pretender and contestant for the throne against Kurigalzu. I cannot see why an identification with Nazimarutša is more improbable than with Nazibugaš. The king of No. 24 would then be *Kadašman-Turgu*.

The texts are an invaluable addition to the literature of the period, and yield rich philological material. The author has edited several with notes, which show wide reading and a fairly adequate grasp of the vast field of Assyriology. He often goes into the field of religion to expose his theory of a 'Trinity in unity,' namely, 'Father, Son, Mother,' but I fear he will find few adherents to his thesis, at least in its present form. Yet his radical views contain some truth; there is no doubt that the Babylonians developed the idea of a 'Son of God,' who became the active principle of creation. They furthermore personified the 'Word' of God as the virgin mother Ištar, a fact which seems to be unnoticed by Radau. Especially ingenious, and it seems to me sound, is his reading of *KA-DI* (p. 19) as *gusir*, identifying this divinity with Ninib of Dir. He is clearly right against Thureau-Dangin and myself in maintaining that *KA-DI* is a male divinity, not a female. I accept also his reading *gusirra* for *gu-nu-ra*, which is of course only a variant of *gusir*. He has likewise shown from letter No. 89 that the temple of Dir was called *Etarakulkalama*.

On the philological side, which after all is the department in which these texts are especially important, the author has made thankful contributions. Of extraordinary value is the phrase No. 40, 8, *mē a-a-u-ti*, 'these waters,' showing that *a-a-u*, *iau* can be used as a demonstrative pronoun both in the singular and the plural. So in *ul iau amēlu*, 'not is this a human,' in Gilgameš, *Épic*, x. col. iv. 17.¹ This same text [No. 40] proves that Hebrew חָמֶץ, late summer, is connected with Babylonian *harbu*, *harpu*, 'stubble ground,' 'harvested field' (Johns), so to be explained against Radau (p. 130), since the Sumerian word is *šel-gidda*, 'plucked harvest.'

¹ The fem. pl. *aṣṣiti* for *aṣṣati*, in R, iv. 60*, 10. It is probable that this demonstrative *au*, *iau*, etc., is identical with the interrogative adjective (Delitzsch, *Handwörterbuch*, 476). It is likely that Heb., Arab., and Syr. *hu*, *hi*, etc. are directly connected with Babylonian *au*, *iau*, which is the basis of the Semitic prefix for imperfects, *ia*.

It is the unpleasant task of a reviewer to emphasize the mistakes of an author, and before adding my philological notes, I would express again my great indebtedness to this book. So important did it seem to me that I put aside my own immediate work to read the book, finding it necessary to know the contents.

The author has proposed a new explanation for the Aramaic phonetic reading of *Ninib*, אֲנוּשָׁה, which he would divide into *en-usātu*, 'lord of help,' or healing.² This seems to me hopelessly impossible, since it is based upon the supposition that Semitic *usātu*, 'support,' is connected with the Sumerian loan-word *asu*, 'doctor,' 'healer' [p. ix]; besides, none of the titles of Ninib emphasize him as 'god of healing.'

Page 9. I quite agree with Radau that *Enlil* was sometimes pronounced *bēl*. Marduk is frequently called *Enlil of the gods* and *EN*, i.e., *bēl* is used directly for Enlil in *B.M.*, 81-7-1, 9, line 4 [*P.S.B.A.*, 1889]. *bēlu* means 'Enlil' in Reissner's *Sumerisch-Babylonische Hymnen*, 80, 14.³

P. 20. The reference is Sp. 1, 131, not 331.

P. 26. *ittannašunuti* is probably for *iddan*, etc., from *nadānu*; cf. p. 57, rev. 7; *ḥinnu* means 'hull of a ship,' 'body of a chariot' (*Z.A.* xvii. 193; Johns, *A.D.D.* ii. 117). Radau's text shows that the original was *uḥinu* and a loan-word. The *uḥinu* of stone and gold must have been little relics or ornaments like the *makurru*, 'boat of silver' (*J.A.O.S.*, 27, 299).

P. 35. The derivation of *itū*, 'side' from אֵתָה, 'to see,' is at least questionable.

P. 37. *Šupparšakku* is certainly a loan-word, and can have no Semitic derivation.

P. 39. II. R. 35a, 18, 'Ištar of Eridu' (?). It is doubtful whether a divinity is intended by this passage, in a list of words for 'chamber,' 'cell,' etc.

P. 46, l. 3. *Pindu* is the same word as *igin-zu* = *pindu* (*S.A.I.*, 2645), to be derived from יָדַע, 'to know,' as the Sumerian root *zu* indicates.

² Hrozný, *Revue Sémitique*, 1908, 'Ninib und Sumer,' read *en-namaštu*, 'lord of flocks.'

³ The German excavators found the Aramaic letters NB upon bricks in the outer wall of Babylon, which have been explained as an abbreviation for *Nimitti-Bēl*, the commonly accepted name for the outer wall of the ancient city. If this identification and reading be correct, then *enlil* must be rendered by *bēl* in Semitic in this case, since the name is written without exception *Nimitti-ilu-enlil*.

The Sumerian form *i-gi-in-zu* is exclamatory 'oh know!' hence all the words *abbūna*, *uka*, *la mašil*, etc. (*S.A.I.* 2636-51), are Semitic interjections for 'surely,' 'verily,' 'certainly,' etc.; *pindu* = *wadū*, *windū*, 'the knower,' evidently also an interjection.

P. 47, 5. *Epir ummani paššur niši*, 'food of the artisans,' 'platter of the people.' Radau's interpretation is perfectly correct. A parallel passage is *S.B.H.*, 101, 15. *Ištar* is the *paššur ubarti ipteru mati*; *ubartu* means 'underworld' [*S.B.H.*, 118, 53], and *paššur* is explained by Sumerian *baššur*, hence *Ištar*, 'the platter for the dead,' as goddess who presides over the cult of the dead; see also my *Sumerian-Babylonian Psalms*, p. 11. *ipteru māti*, explained by *kagub kanagga* and *kagub* = *patānu*, hence *ipteru*, 'certainly' = *ipru*, 'nourishment'; cf. *Babyloniaca*, ii. 207.

P. 49, No. 24, 18. Read *ša sar-ra in ga-ti . . . iddinu*, 'which the king gave into my hand.'

Note 1. *Girra* and *gir* in proper names is *girū*, 'opponent.' Ranke, *Personal Names*, 229. Radau's explanation, *gir* = Sum. *gim* is quite impossible.

Note 3. Read *uku-nita* (*Babyloniaca*, i. 289)

P. 52, l. 4. Read *ša-a'-lu-tu-nu* (?).

P. 87. The explanation of *šakanakku* from Semitic *ša* and *kanāku*, 'to seal,' would have to be paralleled by other compositions with *ša*, or otherwise satisfactorily explained (by syns. or Sumerian equivalents).

P. 98, 12. Read *allu*, perhaps 'pick-axe.'

P. 104, 34. The text and context induce *li-ḫi-iṭ* (!).

Note 1, *aššu* for *aššum* would be strange if not impossible.

P. 105, 6. *Adru*, 'court,' is the same loan-word as *aduru* (*Babyloniaca*, ii. 105).

P. 111, 9. Read *tušrib-šunuti* (?), 'thou shalt cause them to be replaced,' from ריב [conjectural].

P. 119, 16. 'On the second I will commence to gather taxes.' *Kam* can be used only after ordinals, correct also p. 98, 12.

P. 122, 6. *Ruḫḫu*, 'empty,' not 'far away.'

P. 123, 10, etc. Read *gušuru*, 'beams'; there is, so far as I know, no reason for identifying ^{šam}*PUHUD-ŠAR* or ^{šam}*É + AŠ-ŠAR* with a possible (?) ^{giš}*PUHUD*.

P. 128, n. 2. Cf. *ūmi maḥāri*, Hrozný, *Briefe aus Ta'anek*, No. 5, 14.

P. 132, 20. Read *lipašir* (?), 'that he may open, free,' etc.

P. 24. The text has *ki*, for *ki-a-am* (?).

P. 26. *Maṭū* cannot mean 'wail,' 'complain,' contrary to Jensen, but 'lack strength,' 'be in dejection.' I would translate, 'that the irrigation fail not.' The meaning of *maṭū* and Sum. *lal* = 'fail,' 'be wanting,' is sure (with Delitzsch). Cf. *maṭū* = *šihru* (K, 2040, 5), *umtaṭi* (ii.²), 'becomes less' (*Ham. Code*, 16, 73).

P. 149. *Sin-kara-bi-eš-me*, perhaps for *Itti-sin-karbi-ešme* (!).

The Life of Faith.

BY PROFESSOR THE REV. W. W. HOLDSWORTH, M.A., HANDSWORTH.

Spiritual Life a Spiritual Communion.

WE have seen that the life of faith begins with that submission of spirit which lays the heart open to the presence and power of Christ, perfecting in the believer that which He begins when He makes His first appeal to their impotent spirits. We have seen that that act of surrender is followed by a corresponding act on the part of Christ; that He commits Himself to the spirit that has realized 'the obedience of faith.' We may now

go on to consider the resultant life, and while this theme may be said to be the central teaching of all St. John's writing, we shall find it put before us in clearest and most continuous form in those chapters of the Fourth Gospel which give us the last discourses of our Lord before His passion, when life imminent had begun to cast the shadow death. The section of the Fourth Gospel which begins with the fifteenth chapter is pre-eminently

that in which life is put before us as a great spiritual communion, and the Saviour concludes His description of its issues by the great prayer in which that life, both in Himself and also in His disciples, was consecrated to the glory of God.

The never-to-be-forgotten sanctities of the Upper Room had now come to an end, and these discourses were spoken during some pause which our Lord must have made in the courts of the temple before He left them for the last time. Over its gates was carved in golden leaf and filament and cluster, a climbing vine. It was the pride and symbol of that spiritual Israel which had lived in vision for many a prophet. It stood for a life fulfilled in fruit; a life realized in that pouring forth of itself whose perfect expression is sacrifice. The symbolism of the vine has been put before us in all but perfect words by Mrs. Hamilton King in 'The Disciples.'

The husbandman comes early with the pruning hooks and shears

And strips it bare of all its innocent pride
And wandering garlands, and cuts deep and sure,
Unsparring for its tenderness and joy.
And in its loss and pain it wasteth not,
But yields itself with unabated life
More perfect under the despoiling hand. . . .
Then comes the vintage, for the days are ripe.
And surely now in its perfected bloom,
It may rejoice a little in its crown,
Though it bend low beneath the weight of it,
Wrought out of the long striving of its heart.
But ah! the hands are ready to tear down
The treasures of the grapes; the feet are there
To tread them in the winepress, gathered in,
Until the blood-red rivers of the wine
Run over, and the land is full of joy.
But the vine standeth stripped and desolate, having given
all. . . .

And all the winter-time the wine gives joy
To those who else were dismal in the cold;
But the vine standeth out amid the frost,
The winter through, and next year blooms again
Not bitter for the fulness yielded up,
As fair and fruitful towards the sacrifice,
As if no touch had ever come to it
But the soft airs of heaven and dews of earth;
And so fulfils itself in love once more.

Such had been the ideal of Israel, to bring, by the outpouring of life, the joy of life to all the world. But that ideal had never been fulfilled by Israel, and as He who was the embodiment of all that was true in His nation's life looked upon the emblem, He knew Himself to be its fulfilment.

He was the 'true,' the ideal, vine.¹ But having made that which was at once an admission and a claim, the Saviour passes to consider the position of His Disciples. His own relation to them was too close, too intimate, for Him to hesitate. All that He was they were too. For their life stood in Him as His life was to be discovered in them. Their mutual fellowship of faith meant vital union. They were vine and branches, and the flow, the efflorescence, of life in Him was to be shared by them. Nor were they less united in suffering. For them, as for Him, that life was to obtain fulfilment through pain and strife. As branches they were to expect the pruner's knife to cleanse them of the deadly superfluities of life. That cleansing would be due to the power inherent in the revelation which He had given them in Himself. The thought is not so much that His teaching is to be the instrument of their cleansing as that the removal of the superfluous, and therefore dangerous, part of life is the issue of that one revelation given in Christ.² So carefully does the Apostle avoid any suggestion of artificiality in the relations between the believer and His Lord. Each effect is the natural issue of an inherent life. The vine had no purpose but the bearing of fruit, and in all that led up to this, and in the actual bearing of the fruit, the sharp sundering knife was to be recognized as accomplishing an essential process. Everything which impaired the bearing of fruit was to be taken away. In his acceptance of the suffering conditional to fruitfulness there was to be discovered the fulfilment of the Father's will, and in the bearing of much fruit the disciple was to prove himself³ ever more and more the disciple of Christ.

Nor was it any scanty harvest that should follow. That which is common to Christ and

¹ ἡ ἀμπελος ἡ ἀληθινή. This seems to be the force of the adjective as distinguished from ἀληθης = 'real.' See 1 Jn 2⁸, where the two adjectives appear in a connotation that decides in favour of this distinction. The *ideal* light now shineth and reveals that the old commandment has been made new. And this renewing of the commandment is real—belongs to the order of life—both in Him and in you.

² καθαροί ἐστε διὰ τὸν λόγον. Not διὰ τοῦ λόγου, which would be instrumental.

Cf. Eph 5²⁸, καθάρισας (τὴν ἐκκλησίαν) τῷ λευτῷ τοῦ ὕδατος ἐν ῥήματι.

See also Westcott on 1 Jn 15³.

³ ἵνα γένησθε ἔμοι μαθηταί, lit. 'that ye may become to me disciples.' Following the reading of BDL.

the believer is no pinched and poverty-stricken life. The same full and overflowing vitality which throngs the pulse, and breaks out in every generous expression of life, the hundredfold return of the one seed which is cast into the ground, will be found in the disciple as it is found in Him who by the outpouring of His own blood has quickened the souls of countless generations of men.

The scanty, stunted fruitage which is the common feature of our life makes our Lord's words of supreme importance to us, 'He that abideth in me, and I in him, the same beareth much fruit.' The condition of a fruitful life then lies in this, 'abiding in Christ.' What do the words mean? They are not unfamiliar in our modern speech. They have become a formula easily used, and often imperfectly understood. Indeed, it is to be questioned whether we shall ever in this life grasp the idea of a perfect fusion between two personalities, but in those rare moments that come to us when most the spirit life is clearly seen, we may know ourselves so truly one with Christ that His thought becomes our thought, His purpose is the purpose of our life, and our meat and drink is the doing of His will. Sometimes He is so truly one with us that the very thought that some plan or project of ours is contrary to His mind and will is enough to make us that moment cast it from us as something alien and hostile to ourselves. In such moments it is that we know our Lord so close to us that nothing can come between Him and us; it is then that we know Him to be so truly one with us that life apart from Him is no life for us. We live only as He is to us the breath we breathe, the force that actuates in us. There is a beautiful plant that finds its life in the sea. In that great 'element' it lives, and moves, and has its being. So intimate is the connexion between them that we scarce can say whether the plant is in the sea, or the sea in the plant. We lift it from the ocean in which it lives, and in a few moments frond and filament are flaccid in our hands; death has begun already, and we are glad to cast it from us. It lives only so far as it is in the ocean and the ocean in it. But, after all, what can be more suggestive than the figure used by our Lord Himself? Vine and branch in vital union, and between them both one life. One life! That may be fairly grasped and understood. What makes our difficulty is the act that unites man and God. It is the

blending of two differing personalities that gives us pause. How is that brought about? What are the conditions of its realization? It cannot be the absorption of the Buddhist. Men cannot finally satisfy themselves with a mental concept which disannuls and dishonours the individuality with which God has endowed them. But the opposite extreme of thought in this connexion is equally unsatisfactory. To take 'life in God' to indicate a mere acceptance of the divine will as something outside ourselves to which we conform, is to empty the words of their true significance. Either of these very different interpretations renders the great truth sterile of that which it is intended to beget. We are saved from both by a *true interpretation of faith*. If faith be the willing submission of the individual spirit to its Lord, then the freedom of the individual is honoured in the act of submission; and our obedience does not become an inevitable sequence obliterating all that made life rich and deep, and divine. Neither does it share the weakness which belongs to the induced sentiment, the enforced compliance. Rather we know that we consciously and willingly—retaining all that has made the honour of our life hitherto—yield ourselves up to be His bond-servants that we may know a true obedience, by each new submission of spirit becoming more truly His.¹ But that act of ours does not stand alone. It is met by a divine response. Faith receives its answer in the divine grace that stoops to the heart thus opened to receive, and God enters into communion with the spirit of man.

Further than this we cannot go. We have entered into the world of spiritual causes, and thought stops short. It is only when we find in the effects of prevailing prayer, of increasing power, of spiritual joy, effects too great to be attributed to any lesser cause that we are made confident, and know that though we cannot explain how the divine and the human can meet and make one life, yet only the fact of that one life sufficiently accounts for the spiritual experience of the saints of God in all ages of the world. We

¹ ὃ παριστάνετε ἑαυτοὺς δούλους εἰς ὑπακοήν δοῦλοι εστέ ᾧ ὑπακούετε (Ro 6¹⁸). The second relative clause is difficult, but its force will be seen by giving its full value to the present indicative ὑπακούετε. 'His slaves ye are, and continually or increasingly ye obey him.' Godet renders the clause by 'to whom obedience is the order of the day.'

see also that in the appeal for faith the righteousness of God is one with the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ,¹ and in the very act in which He is divinely compassionate His imperative demands are most clearly seen, while in the moment in which man obeys he knows that he loves supremely.

There is thus no break in the thought of our Lord when in the closing verses of this passage He passes to speak of love. If life be communion, there is no wonder that love should appear in the thought, for love is communion too. Of this love we have brought before us in the context two thoughts. In the ninth verse its quality is set before us, and in the tenth its object is shown to be our Lord Himself.² 'As the Father hath loved me, so have I loved you; continue ye from day to day in that love which is my very own, which is of my being, which is myself. As the Father hath loved me, so have I loved you.'

¹ τὴν περισσεύαν τῆς χάριτος καὶ τῆς δικαιοσύνης λαμβάναντες ἐν ζωῇ βασιλεύουσι διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ (Ro 5¹⁷). The failure to see how both the *χάρις* and the *δικαιοσύνη* might abound together in the one Incarnation may account for the reading τῆς δωρεάς.

² μένωτε ἐν τῇ ἀγαπῇ τῇ ἐμῇ. The full force of the tense should be brought out. For ἡ ἀγαπῇ ἡ ἐμῇ as distinguished from ἡ ἀγαπῇ μου in the next verse, cf. ἡ χάρις ἡ ἐμῇ (5¹¹) and ἡ εἰρήνῃ ἡ ἐμῇ (14²⁷).

See also Westcott *in loc.*

Here our thought is lifted up into that fine air which breathes over the heights sublime of deity. We are in the presence of a love which belongs to the heart of God, a love at which we faintly guess when we speak of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost as making all that we can know when we say that 'God is love.' 'Into that divine communion,' says Christ, 'you enter when you live one life with me by faith. Abide in the love for which I stand.'

But that love is not left in an indefiniteness which would rob it of power, and so its object is declared, and by a swift and subtle change in wording we read that the love with such a quality is to gather round our Lord Himself. 'In simple obedience your love shall find me; if ye keep my commandments ye shall abide in the love of me.'

We began the passage with life, we close it with love. Who shall separate the two? Who shall speak of love save as that perfect communion whose other name is life? How can we speak of life in its highest unless love be its law? Love and Life; they are the great terms of existence whether human or divine. And between them lie the high effects of purity, of obedience unto death, of heavy fruitage breaking the bough that bears it, of sacrifice. 'Abide in me,' saith the Christ.

Literature.

MYSTICAL RELIGION.

STUDIES IN MYSTICAL RELIGION. By Rufus M. Jones, M.A., D.Litt. (Macmillan. 12s. net.)

THERE is no evidence that the knowledge of Mysticism is at all general yet. But the desire to know must be general. Of that the evidence is abundant. In a steady stream, month after month, great volumes about Mysticism are published. Either the same men must read several volumes in their desperate desire to know, or else the number of readers must now be very large to give every book a chance. It seems as if ecclesiastical religion had lost its attractiveness, and mystical religion were going to have its day. It is

not Mysticism as a philosophy, but Mysticism as a religion, that is so popular now as a study or a pastime. The books that have been published have been written by professors of religion. And the subject has been presented as it appeals to different religious communities. Dr. Inge would not deny that he gave us the Anglican view. Mr. Waite might be credited with the unattached attitude. Baron von Hügel, with great ability, has appeared as the exponent of the historical mysticism of the Roman Catholic Church. Professor Rufus Jones is a Quaker.

There is no body of Christian people, not even the Roman Catholic Church, that has a better right to representation than the Friends. For if the mystical chamber is a House of Lords in which

ancestry gives the right to a place, it is also a House of Commons. The member must have his constituency and the confidence of it, but he must obtain his seat because he is himself a mystic, because he is one for whom Mysticism has done something, one who has done something for Mysticism. Professor Jones is himself a mystic, first because he is a representative Quaker, and next because of Mysticism he has freely received and has freely given. This is a great book. It is not surpassed by the representative book of any other denomination. It is the work of a man whom Mysticism has made great, and who now rejoices to magnify Mysticism.

And for the uninitiated it is the easiest of all the volumes that have been published, and it is the most interesting. The method of it is the historical. The best method. And the history is written not from without but from within. It is not a record of events or of the phenomena of life. It is a report of life itself, of the close walk with God, by one who has himself lived that life and is living it now; by one who is walking and talking with God in the cool of every day. Professor Jones has the historical gift. His chapters on the Anabaptists will stand comparison even with the epoch-making estimate of Principal Lindsay. Not less faithful to the facts, he might be credited with a clearer consciousness of the Anabaptist intention and ideal.

MOMMSEN'S PROVINCES.

THE PROVINCES OF THE ROMAN EMPIRE,
FROM CÆSAR TO DIOCLETIAN. By
Theodor Mommsen. New Edition.
(Macmillan. Two Vols. 21s. net.)

Mommsen may have done greater services to scholarship than the service he did by writing the *History of Rome*. But it is his *History of Rome* that has made him known in the world, and it is by the *History of Rome* that his name will be carried down to the coming generations. As Spenser is the poet's poet, Mommsen is the historian's historian; and it is probable enough that future generations will benefit by his labours, not so much directly as through the works of other historians, to whom he is both a source of information and the breath of inspiration. The *History of Rome* was published in two parts. First came the *History of the Republic* in 1854-55, in three volumes. It was translated by Professor

W. P. Dickson, and issued in five volumes in English in 1862-66. Then in 1885 appeared the fifth volume of the German original, containing the *History of the Provinces of the Roman Empire, from Cæsar to Diocletian*. Mommsen seems never to have intended to write the history of the period which would have occupied the fourth volume. He held that that part of Roman history had been so fully described by the Roman historians themselves that the modern historian could do nothing more than reproduce their narrative. Still he called the new volume the fifth, leaving the gap visible. The fifth volume was also translated by Professor Dickson, and was issued in two English volumes in 1886. It is of these two volumes that we have now the new edition.

The new edition has been edited by Dr. F. J. Haverfield, Camden Professor of Ancient History in the University of Oxford. As the work is stereotyped, Dr. Haverfield has been somewhat restricted in his revision. But some revision was necessary, and indeed has been urgently called for all these years. For the translation of Mommsen's fifth volume was neither so happy nor so accurate as the translation of the first three. Dr. Haverfield in his introduction recalls some well-known but altogether unaccountable mistranslations. He claims that at least the glaring mistakes have been rectified. But as the alterations run into several hundreds, and as account has been taken of the changes which Mommsen himself introduced into the original German down to the fifth and last edition of 1904, it is easy to see that this new edition supersedes the old. It is quite worthy of the book. Though still without the easy flow of the translation of the Republic, it is good English reading, and it is a reliable representation of what Mommsen really believed and wrote.

It is even more than that. Professor Haverfield has added Notes to the chapter on Britain. They are not merely notes of an English writer with a special interest in that chapter, but also of one who is a master of the subject, and whose notes do no disgrace even to the brilliant work of Mommsen.

THE CONFLICT OF RELIGIONS.

THE CONFLICT OF RELIGIONS IN THE
EARLY ROMAN EMPIRE. By T. R. Glover.
(Methuen. 7s. 6d. net.)

This month, as noted on another page, there is published a translation of the *History of the Early*

Church, by a distinguished Roman Catholic scholar. The book before us is the work of a distinguished Free Churchman. Though their purpose is not identical, the two authors cover the same ground, and in their judgments cross and recross one another continually. And we could scarcely conceive a more profitable exercise than the reading of these two works together. Mr. Glover is just as well equipped as Mgr. Duchesne. He is quite as loyal to the truth; he is quite as disinterested in the search for it. But he is more interested in men, Duchesne in movements. He is more concerned for the liberty of the sons of God, Duchesne for the continuity of the Catholic Church. The things which appeal to Mr. Glover are human things. He does not forget that Jesus of Nazareth is also the Lord of Glory. But he is himself most closely drawn by Jesus of Nazareth, and almost seems to think it possible that the manger in Bethlehem had sufficient potentiality in it to yield at last a Christian Church which would cover the earth as the waters cover the sea.

Mr. Glover must be supplemented. We have already said so, and suggested Mgr. Duchesne. He is not theological enough; he is too fascinating, he is too human. The subject of his fourth chapter is Jesus of Nazareth. When he comes to speak of Judas Iscariot in that chapter, he shows that what impresses him most is the inconvenience, the irksomeness, to Jesus, of the presence of Judas after the discovery of his disaffection. 'What this man's constant presence must have meant to Jesus, ordinary experience may suggest. Shrewd, clever, and disappointed, he must have been a chill upon his Master at all hours.'

His leaning to the human has sometimes perhaps to be corrected, not merely supplemented. In the interview with the Syro-Phœnician woman, the Evangelists tell us that it was Jesus who first referred to the dogs eating the crumbs. Mr. Glover would set the Evangelists, at least as we now have them, right. 'I believe that the allusion to dogs has been thrown back into Jesus' words from the woman's reply, and that she was the first to mention them.' And he bids us note Mark's emphatic phrase 'for this word' (7²⁹).

And, more dangerously, he says that Jesus died with the cry—'My God, my God, why hast Thou forsaken me?' He did so, he says, because 'the worn-out frame dragged the spirit with it.'

But what a book it is for interest. Has Mr. Glover begun his *Life of Christ* yet?

THE NEW SEPTUAGINT.

THE OLD TESTAMENT IN GREEK. By A. E. Brooke, B.D., and N. M'Lean, M.A.
(Cambridge University Press. 12s. 6d. net.)

This is perhaps the most important of the publications of the month. It is the second part of the new Septuagint. Let the title be recorded in full: *The Old Testament in Greek*, according to the Text of Codex Vaticanus, supplemented from other Uncial Manuscripts, with a critical Apparatus containing the Variants of the chief ancient Authorities for the Text of the Septuagint. Edited by Alan England Brooke, B.D., Fellow and Dean of King's College, and Norman M'Lean, M.A., Fellow of Christ's College, University Lecturer in Aramaic. Vol. i. 'The Octateuch'; Part II. 'Exodus and Leviticus' (12s. 6d. net).

Now there is not much that can be said about the new part beyond what was said about the First Part of the work when it appeared. The editors themselves do not say much. They tell us, however, that from the beginning of this part the readings of the Roman MS. numbered 108 by Holmes and Parsons have been given, and that the New Testament evidence has been more fully presented. The full text of the New Testament quotations has been printed, so that a comparison between the wording of the Septuagint and the wording of the New Testament quotation can be made at a glance.

But there is a more important matter to which the editors direct our attention. This is a critical edition of the Septuagint, and no student is equipped without it. There is nothing like it, indeed, in literature, or likely to be. But the editors tell us that it is no part of their business to construct the best possible *text* of the Septuagint. For that the reader must go to Swete's edition. They have accordingly adopted some readings for the sake of shortening their notes, without themselves thinking that they are the best readings.

It is unnecessary to add that the very latest literature has been made use of, including the new volume of *Horæ Semiticae*, by Mrs. Lewis, which was published only a month ago.

At the end of the introduction credit is given at

last to the late Dr. H. A. Redpath that is something like adequate to the work he did. At last, we say; for it has been too long delayed. Who is to take his place in the great project of a Dictionary of Patristic Greek? He had planned it and had engaged co-workers on it before he died. Who will encourage and direct them now?

SIX OXFORD THINKERS.

SIX OXFORD THINKERS. By Algernon Cecil, M.A. (Murray. 7s. 6d. net.)

The Six Oxford Thinkers are Edward Gibbon, John Henry Newman, R. W. Church, James Anthony Froude, Walter Pater, Lord Morley of Blackburn. They stand in a certain succession. It is not an ecclesiastical succession, apostolical or other. It is rather the succession of the revolutionary. For in our habit of wide generalizations we are now able to understand that even revolutions work by cause and effect and probably as accurately as gravitation. But Mr. Cecil does not greatly trouble himself to work out the succession. He writes six readable sketches of six men of letters who are all associated with Oxford, and lets them stand in order.

Only twice do the sketches reach distinction. In the one case it is the distinction of admiration, in the other of discontent. The one is Dean Church; the other is Lord Morley. Mr. Cecil disapproves of Lord Morley because he is a Liberal, and the sketch is vitiated. But the sketch of Church is admirable. He speaks of Church's style. Church himself says somewhere that there are two great styles—the self-conscious and the unconscious, or, in other words, the style of Gibbon and Macaulay, and the style of Swift and Pascal and Newman. Church's style is the unconscious. And then Mr. Cecil says: 'Among his University Sermons on *Human Life and its Conditions* there are some whose restrained beauty and mystic intensity are not surpassed by anything that Newman ever wrote.'

He holds that Church 'possessed that marvellous quality of reserve, which sets so wide a gulf between the manner of Christ and the manner of St. Paul. As he says of Newman, so of himself, it is true that "he did not try to draw men to him. He was no proselytizer; he shrank with fear and repugnance from the character—it was an invasion of the privileges of the heart."'

He says that the word 'awful,' restored for once to its proper meaning, was constantly on the lips both of Newman and of Church; and it was, as it seemed to those who watched him, under the shadow of a great awe that Church passed through the last weeks of his life here.

He quotes Church's saying: 'Our Lord came among us, not to clear up perplexity, but to show us which side to take.'

Among the Books of the Month.

Mr. Allenson has published two volumes of sermons for children, and republished one volume. The republished volume is Mr. J. A. Hamilton's *A Mountain Path* (2s. 6d.). Why does not Mr. Hamilton, who has the gift so supremely, give us more? But the new books are by children's preachers also—*Little Sermons to the Children*, by the Rev. R. C. Gillie, M.A. (1s.), and *In God's Orchard*, by the Rev. James Learmount (3s. 6d.).

Mr. Allenson has also issued a volume of pulpit illustrations called *Parables and Pictures* (2s. 6d.). They are gathered by James S. Drummond. Where has he got them? He should have given the book and the page of it every time. Some are new and some are old, but the point is always obvious. Take these two for sample:

'Admiral Dupont was once explaining to Farragut the reason why he failed to enter Charlestown Harbour with his fleet of ironclads. He gave this reason and that reason and the other reason; and Farragut remained silent until he had got through, and then said, "Ah, Dupont, there was one more reason." "What is that?" "You didn't believe you could do it."'

'An American once wrote to the editor of a newspaper: "Sir, I ploughed my field on a Sunday, I planted and reaped it on a Sunday, and this October my crop is the best in the district." The editor inserted the letter, and added a footnote: "God does not always settle His accounts in October."'

But Mr. Allenson's great book this month comes from America. It is a complete treatise on Theology and Ethics; and the theology is both Biblical and Systematic, and the Ethics is both theoretical and practical. The title is *Man Preparing for other Worlds* (6s.). The author is Mr. W. T. Moore, M.A., LL.D., the same, if we

mistake not, who once was editor of the *Christian Commonwealth*. But that was before the days of Mr. R. J. Campbell and the New Theology. Dr. Moore's theology is not new. Better than that, it is old and tried, and it is held with a conviction and sincerity that make the account of it a delight to read in spite of the multitude of words which the book contains and the many long quotations.

From the American Baptist Publication Society there comes the third and last volume of President A. H. Strong's *Systematic Theology* (\$2.50 net). And now that we have the third volume, with its exhaustive, accurate, and ideal set of indexes, we are more than ever impelled to say that as a storehouse of material on every aspect and department of Systematic Theology there is nothing in the English language like this book. Moreover, the material is sifted. It is selected and sifted and set forth clearly. It is a library in itself, and will save the buying of many books.

Messrs. Bagster have published a little volume of *Studies in the New Testament*, by W. T. Lynn, B.A., F.R.A.S. (1s. 6d. net). They are chiefly on the Parables, Miracles, and the Chronology.

The new volume of *Horæ Semiticae* is a transcription of *Codex Climaci Rescriptus* (Cambridge University Press; 10s. 6d. net), made by Mrs. Agnes Smith Lewis, M.R.A.S., D.D., LL.D., Ph.D., with seven facsimiles. This codex contains Fragments of Sixth Century Palestinian Syriac Texts of the Gospels, of the Acts of the Apostles, and of St. Paul's Epistles, together with Fragments of an Early Palestinian Lectionary of the Old Testament. It is a contribution to our knowledge of Christian Aramaic literature. Mrs. Lewis looks forward to the time when the whole of the New Testament in this ancient version will be in our hands. When that happy time arrives her name will not be forgotten. She tells the romantic story of the purchase of the MS., and she dedicates the volume to Mrs. Gibson—*Animæ Dimidio Suæ Sorori Gemellæ*.

It is some time since we have seen the name Fausset in Biblical literature. It was once very familiar. It appears now as W. Yorke Fausset, M.A., Rector of Timsbury and Prebendary of

Wells, and as the name of the author of an edition of Novatian's *De Trinitate* (6s. net), a volume of the Cambridge Patristic Texts.

But we must hasten to the last and most welcome of all the volumes which the Cambridge Press has issued. It is a *Grammar of the Old Testament in Greek*, according to the Septuagint, by Henry St. John Thackeray, M.A. (8s. net). It is not a complete grammar. It is the first of two volumes. It contains the introduction, orthography, and accidence. Some account of its contents is given on another page. It is enough to say here that Mr. Thackeray has supplied one of the ugliest gaps in our bookshelves, and that he is of all men the man to supply it.

Quite unconsciously, and therefore very significantly, the Principal of Hackney College and the Bishop of Durham have been moving in thought towards identical conclusions, and have been expressing themselves identically. Principal Forsyth has spoken at the annual meetings of the Congregational Union, Bishop Moule in a volume entitled *Faith* (Cassell; 3s. 6d.). Have you read Dr. Forsyth? Then listen to these words of Bishop Moule: 'Very little is said now in the sense of that memorable answer to the question, "What is the chief and highest end of man?"—"*To glorify God and to enjoy Him for ever.*" It would seem to be assumed that rather God exists for man than man for God; that the highest aim of man is to realize himself, and that the work, I had almost dared to say the duty, of God is to enable man to do so.'

To your library of bibliography add Gomme's *Index of Archaeological Papers*, published in 1907 (Constable), remembering that, while ordinary books fall, books in bibliography rise, in value with the years.

Mr. Culley is making the Wesleyan Book-Room one of the most active publishing offices of our time. He has just projected a new series, which he calls the 'Finsbury Library'—thick good-looking volumes to be sold at 1s. net. Already six volumes have been issued of the Library, among them inevitably the Journal of John Wesley.

Mr. Culley has also added a volume to his 'Library of Methodist Biography.' *William*

Bramwell, Revivalist, by the Rev. C. W. Andrews, B.A., B.D. (1s. net.).

Messrs. Dent have laid the student of the history of religion under a great obligation by issuing a translation of Count Lützow's *Life and Times of Master John Hus* (12s. 6d. net). The translation has life in it, not only making us forget that it is a translation, but carrying us along in its vigorous movement as only rarely a book even written in English does. Then it is a handsome volume, beautifully printed, and furnished with all the necessary pictures and plans.

Count Lützow believes in Hus. There is no giving with one hand that he may take back with the other. He admires Hus as a man greatly. He believes heartily in the Hussite movement. And just because he is in sympathy with Hus and the Hussites he has been most particular to verify everything by the original documents and to test his own conclusions by the conclusions of other historians.

Count Lützow's *Hus* is to be regarded as one of the great contributions to historical biography. Place it beside Köstlin's *Luther*. It restores a great man to his place in the world; it vindicates the originality and the blessing of a great movement.

It may be a good, or it may be a bad, but it is a highly significant sign of the times that an Edinburgh publisher has determined to run the risk of a complete translation into English of the works of Friedrich Nietzsche. The edition will extend to eighteen volumes. The publisher is Mr. T. N. Foulis, Frederick Street.

Four volumes have been issued. *Thoughts out of Season* appears in two volumes, each 2s. 6d. net, the first volume being translated by Anthony M. Ludovici, the second by Adrian Collins, M.A. Of this book the first impression consists of a thousand copies, and each copy is numbered. *Beyond Good and Evil* is issued in a single volume (3s. 6d. net). It is a reprint of Helen Zimmern's translation. It is described as the second edition of 2000 copies, and again each copy is numbered. The fourth volume is the *Birth of Tragedy* (2s. 6d. net). Each copy is numbered of a first edition of 1500 copies. The translator is William A. Haussmann, Ph.D. The general editor is Dr. Oscar Levy; who else could it have been? Now

we have often been told that we must read Nietzsche, and some of us have begun to read him. We have also been told in what order his books should be read. But the order is not of so much account as some grandmotherly reviewers seem to think. There are only a few who will ever be able to read Nietzsche, only a few even of those who take some interest in the problems of life and philosophy; and it is better to leave them to happen upon him as they will or miss him altogether. Of the few who read Nietzsche only a minority will get any real good out of him. The rest will simply be lifted up with pride.

The Professor of Moral Philosophy in the University of Oxford has a captivating command of language, sometimes recalling even the daring liberties of Professor William James. For Dr. Stewart is also from America. Well, his new book needs all the gift of fascinating writing which he possesses. For it is an exposition of *Plato's Doctrine of Ideas* (Clarendon Press; 6s. net), a subject of surpassing difficulty and elusiveness. Dr. Stewart divides his book into two parts. The first part contains the doctrine of ideas as a contribution to methodology; the second part contains that doctrine as expressing æsthetic experience. The first is the more difficult part of the exposition, and in it Professor Stewart handles the Dialogues separately. The conclusion he comes to is that the 'idea' of a virtue is, in Plato's language, its *context*. Thus the idea of courage is stated when the virtue so-called is defined in relation to the part which it plays in the Social System—when its 'final cause,' or 'use,' is set forth—when the standing need which it meets, and the particular manner in which it meets that need, have been fully explained.

Mr. Frowde is the publisher of the *Church Hymnary*, which we may now have from him, clearly printed and complete, for 1d. net.

He is also the publisher of the *Scotfield Reference Bible*. This is an edition of the Bible according to the Authorized Version, which contains a new system of connected topical references to all the greater themes of Scripture, with Annotations, Revised Marginal Renderings, Summaries, Definitions, and Index. It is edited by the Rev. C. I. Scotfield, D.D., aided by others, among whom we observe Dr. A. T. Pierson.

Its virtue lies in the value of the topical references. They are footnotes and they are quite few. Here is one of them. It is given at the first occurrence of the name of Balaam (Nu 22⁵).

'Balaam is the typical hireling prophet, seeking only to make a market of his gift. This is "the way of Balaam" (2 P 2¹⁵), and characterizes false teachers. The "error of Balaam" (Jude 2) was that he could see only the natural morality—a holy God, he reasoned, *must* curse such a people as Israel. Like all false teachers he was ignorant of the higher morality of vicarious atonement, by which God could be just and yet the justifier of believing sinners (Ro 3²⁶). The "doctrine of Balaam" (Rev 2¹⁴) refers to his teaching Balak to corrupt the people whom he could not curse (Nu 31¹⁶, with Nu 25¹⁻³ and Ja 4⁴). Spiritually, Balaamism in teaching never rises above natural reasonings; in practice, it is easy world-conformity.'

Mr. Francis Griffiths continues the publication of 'Essays for the Times.' Here are the titles of some of the new issues; *The 'Fioretti' and the Gospels*, by Charles J. Shebbeare, M.A.; *The True Place of the Holy Sepulchre*, by 'Peladan'; *The Roman See in the First Centuries*, by William Ernest Beet, M.A.; *The Mystery of Mysticism*, by the Rev. A. W. Hopkinson, M.A.; *The Science of Religion*, by the Rev. Henry D. A. Major, M.A.

Mr. Griffiths has also begun a series of 'Primers for Bible Students,' and a further series on 'English Revolutionary Leaders.' Then he has published another volume of the 'Biblical Illustrator,' edited by the Rev. Joseph S. Exell, M.A. It completes the Book of Isaiah. These are all up-to-date publications. Even the Biblical Illustrator takes account of the most recent volumes of homiletic literature.

But the most modern book in Mr. Griffiths' list this month is an anonymous volume with the innocent title *Is Death the End?* (3s. net). It is said to be by 'a well-known writer,' and that is not by any means impossible, for not only popular writers but even writers of ability and scholarship lose their heads and begin to drivel when they accept as evidence for a life after death that which comes from the hand of a spiritualistic medium. Of the two things which this well-known writer says the Society for Psychical Research has done, namely, that it has demonstrated the fact of hypnotism and established the truth of telepathy,

no one is in doubt; but neither is any one in doubt that neither that Society nor this book furnishes any proof whatever that 'the dead commune with the living.'

Four volumes have been added to Harper's 'Library of Living Thought' (2s. 6d. net each). One of the volumes is a translation, made by the Headmaster of Plymouth College, of Professor Becker's *Christianity and Islam*. Professor Becker says that there are three reasons for comparing Christianity with Islam. The missionary may consider that it will increase the efficacy of his proselytizing work; the ecclesiastic may look for proofs of the superiority of Christianity in the interests of Apologetic; the historian may wish to understand the influence which the one religion has exerted on the other in order to add to the scientific knowledge of the world. Professor Becker himself wishes to add to the scientific knowledge of the world. He sits pretty loose to the doctrines of Christianity, and even to what are generally considered its facts. But he is a good scholar and fair-minded. The air he asks us to breathe is somewhat thin, but if we can breathe it it may be bracing.

Another volume is a translation of Wrede's *Origin of the New Testament*. The translation is made by the Rev. James S. Hill, B.D.

The latest addition is in two volumes. It is a translation of *The Life of the Universe* of Dr. Arrhenius of the Nobel Institute in Stockholm, Dr. H. Borns being the translator. It is a complete history, and by a master hand, of the progress of Astrology and Astronomy from the dawn of knowledge to the present day. And although it is brief, for so vast a subject, there is no difficulty in the reading of it, and it has something to teach even the best instructed astronomer. There are a few illustrations throughout the pages.

Professor Kent of Yale has begun the issue of a series of volumes which are meant to be companions to the volumes of his Student's Old Testament. They are not to be companions on an equality, however, but rather squires to those nobler knights. Perhaps they will simply be taken to be short popular summaries of those great scholarly volumes; and if so they will not be taken altogether amiss. The general title is 'The Historical Bible.' Two volumes are

published, one entitled *The Heroes and Crises of Early Hebrew History*; the other, *The Founders and Rulers of United Israel* (5s. net each). The publishers in this country are Messrs. Hodder & Stoughton.

Messrs. Hodder & Stoughton have also published a new volume by Mr. G. H. Pember. Its title is *The Great Prophecies of the Centuries concerning the Church* (7s. 6d.). It is a supplement to the volume on *The Great Prophecies of the Centuries concerning Israel and the Gentiles*. It is, in short, an examination of the literature of the New Testament in the interests of prophetic interpretation.

Mr. Pember, it has to be admitted, is now quite away from the main stream in which the interpretation of Scripture flows. This is nowhere seen more evidently than in his treatment of the Apocalypse. For him Bousset and Gunkel do not exist, nor even Sir William Ramsay. He finds no use for them. Is it possible, then, that fruitfulness follows where his own little river flows; or has it become at last visibly and unmistakably a stagnant and unrefreshing pool? We may readily admit that much of what Gunkel and Bousset have written will pass away. But for the present, the student of the Apocalypse, and of the New Testament generally, should read Professor Swete, who represents all that is sober-minded in interpretation and is a whole continent apart from Mr. Pember.

Another volume issued by Messrs. Hodder & Stoughton comes from the pen of the accomplished author, Mr. Joseph Compton-Rickett. Its title is *Origins and Faith* (6s.). In all that Mr. Compton-Rickett writes there is pleasure, pleasure for us, pleasure, we should think, for almost everybody. This is an essay of reconciliation. And the only fault that we have to find with it is that it secures its reconciliation by not ploughing too deep. On the greatest subjects, such as the doctrine of the Atonement, it does not go deep enough. Certainly the doctrine of reconciliation by the blood of Christ was and is something more than a concession to Jewish ceremonialism. Reconciliation by blood was a deep fact in the heart of the Jew, and it has had a universal response in the heart of the Gentile when the Gentile has had strength enough, of heart and of will, to make the response.

Professor W. H. Bennett has written the volume

on *Old Testament History*, and Professor R. Mackintosh the volume on *Christian Ethics*, for Dr. Adeney's 'Century Bible Handbooks' (Jack; rs. net each). Professor Mackintosh retains the title 'Christian Ethics' deliberately. He does not believe, with Dorner, that, as general philosophical Ethics ripens, separate treatment of Christian Ethics must fade away. Nor does he believe, with Herrmann, that philosophical Ethics knows what right is, while Christian Ethics knows and does what is right. Dr. Mackintosh holds that the philosopher may never be able to say 'the love of Christ constraineth us,' and that we have no right to make him say so.

But have we no right? If we ourselves must say so, and Dr. Mackintosh says we must, is it not equally our duty to get other men to say so? And is it not our duty to hold their work to be inferior and incomplete until they do say so?

Of the books on Christian Ethics in existence Professor Mackintosh seems to be most drawn by Dr. T. B. Kilpatrick's book on *Christian Character*—'probably the best thing on Christian Ethics in our language for zeal and enthusiasm.'

The first volume of the *Annals of Archaeology and Anthropology* issued by the University of Liverpool is now complete. It contains the four parts separately published. The editor is Professor J. L. Myres, with whom have collaborated some of the most distinguished archæologists of our day.

The volume as a whole obtains value chiefly from the fact that it is a record of the most important discoveries brought up to date. Contributions are often very brief, but sufficient, and they are made by the men and women who are on the spot. The letterpress and the illustrations are both admirable.

The fourth part contains an account by Mr. John Garstang of the excavations at Sakje-Geuzi in North Syria, an authoritative account and the most accessible that we have in English. Sakje-Geuzi is a small village at the foot of the Qurt-Dagh range, lying in a valley that is shut in by that range on the east, and by the Giaour-Dagh range on the west. It is only a few hours distant from Sinjirli. The mounds with which the whole district is strewn are due, Mr. Garstang has no doubt, to the desire of the people to live as high as possible above the marshy plain. Professor Sayce believes that the sculptures which have

been found in these mounds are the work of the Hittites of North Syria, dating between the campaign of Assur-nazir-pal in 880 B.C. and the conquests of Tiglath-Pileser III. about 730 B.C. Mr. Garstang agrees with this opinion.

We have touched on but one of the articles; we strongly recommend the whole work.

Armitage Robinson's Commentary on the Epistle to the Ephesians, published in 1903, has superseded all other commentaries. We are not sure that it did not prevent Westcott's Commentary, which was published three years later, from being seriously considered. It consists of two parts. The first half of the book is occupied with a running exposition, interspersed with paraphrase. The second half contains the Greek of the Epistle, with word for word exposition in double columns below, as we are familiar with it in Lightfoot. For the student ignorant of Greek the first part is the more profitable, and that part has now been published separately. The title is *St. Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians: An Exposition* (Macmillan; 2s. 6d. net).

Messrs. Marshall Brothers have published uniformly the autobiography of a Missionary, with the title *This is my Story*; and an outline study of the Apocalypse, by H. W. Mackintosh, with the title *Things to Come* (1s. net each).

They have also issued *The Hebrew Christian and his National Continuity* (1s. 6d. net), a real contribution to a subject of immense consequence, the question, whether a Jew may become a Christian and yet remain a Jew. The author is Mr. Philip Cohen, a Jewish missionary in South Africa.

There are now three independent and admirable versions of the New Testament in modern English—Lloyd's, which is the latest and most conservative; Weymouth's, which is enjoyed for its scholarship and choice of the middle way; and *The Twentieth Century New Testament*, which is the only one that is written in modern speech, without consideration for the feelings of the antiquarian. *The Twentieth Century New Testament* must be got in its revised edition, which was issued in 1904. And that revised edition should, if possible, be had in the handsome form in which it has just been issued by its enterprising publishers, Messrs. Horace Marshall & Son (5s. net).

It is a long, long time since we have had a monograph of any magnitude on St. John. For the difficulties are enormous, and they are round us yet on every hand. But we cannot wait till science settles this and that book's date before we begin to preach, and we are thankful when a sufficiently furnished scholar has the courage to write a biography of St. John to tell us at least where we stand. The author is the Rev. C. E. Scott-Moncrieff, D.D., Vicar of Blyth, and Examining Chaplain to the Bishop of Southwell, unmistakably a scholar with a knowledge of the literature, with a knowledge also that there is something deeper in St. John than the literature touches. He covers the whole ground, and gives his book the title of *St. John, Apostle, Evangelist, and Prophet* (Nisbet; 4s. 6d. net).

The new volume of the 'Westminster New Testament' is *Thessalonians and Corinthians* (Melrose; 2s. net). The author is Professor Robert Mackintosh of Manchester. Dr. Mackintosh has not been allowed much space for these Epistles, but he seems to be one of those beings who thrive best in confinement. His exposition often consists of a single alternative word, and that alternative word is enough. When the new translation of the Bible is projected Professor Mackintosh should have a seat on the committee.

When you call at the bookseller's for some little book to give to a friend, whether it is for a young man or an old woman, ask first of all for a volume of Oliphant, Anderson & Ferrier's 'Living Thoughts' series. They are beautifully got up, they cost but sixpence each, and they have been chosen by some one who has made a conscience of it, every one of them having the literary gift which makes them readable and the spiritual insight which makes them profitable. The new volume is by the Rev. Harrington C. Lees, M.A. Its title is *When Jesus Came*.

The convert to Christianity is nearly always now a remarkable man or woman. Among the uncivilized races there are still converts, crowds of them sometimes, thank God, that are just ordinary men and women. But in civilized countries the convert who owns to his conversion is so marked a man that he must be a remarkable man. Such a man was the Rev. Dhanjibhai Nauroji, the first modern convert to Christianity from the Zoroastrian

religion. How remarkable he was, how modest and how brave, and what Christ did for him may be read in a book called *From Zoroaster to Christ* (Oliphant, Anderson & Ferrier; 2s.). It is a brief autobiography, edited by Dr. Mackichan of Bombay.

What is the best antidote to Christian Science? It is not exposure of its innumerable absurdities. For that has been done many a time, and the oftener it is done, the more Christian Science seems to thrive. Perhaps the Emmanuel Movement will be its antidote. The Emmanuel movement began a year or two ago in Boston. It takes all that is good in Christian Science and rejects all that is evil. Dr. Worcester and Dr. McComb, collegiate ministers of Emmanuel Church there, are at the head of it. They work along with the medical men, by whom every case of illness is first diagnosed. A reliable account of the movement may be found in a book called *The Emmanuel Movement in a New England Town*, written by L. P. Powell, Rector of St. John's Church, Northampton, Mass. (Putnam; 5s. net).

We are commanded to be ready always to give an answer to every man who asks us a reason of the hope that is in us. Dr. Horton has obeyed the command unreservedly in *The Triumph of the Cross* (R.T.S.; 1s. net).

In the Devotional Commentary (also published by the R.T.S.), *Genesis* has been done by Dr.

Griffith Thomas. It has been done in three volumes; the third volume has just reached us. Here as everywhere else, and he is a prolific writer, Dr. Griffith Thomas always writes so that you are compelled to read him (2s.).

Messrs. Sands & Co. are the publishers in this country of a little book which explains, 'for Catholic book lovers and students,' *The Roman Index of Forbidden Books*. The author is Francis S. Betten, S.J.

Some pleasant things are said in *How to make the Lord's Day a Delight*, by the late Canon Parker of Bristol (Elliot Stock; 1s. 6d. net). They make this book about the Lord's Day a delight.

But there is more matter in *Messages from the Epistle to the Hebrews* (Stock; 2s. net), a collection of what would be called Bible readings, by the Bishop of Durham.

It is enough to note the issue of volumes iv. and v. of *The Catechism in Examples*, by the Rev. D. Chisholm, Priest of the Diocese of Aberdeen (Washbourne). These volumes complete the work.

To the R.P.A. reprints have been added a new edition of Bölsche's *Haeckel*, the first part of Conway's *Life of Thomas Paine*, and a *Selection from Paine's Political Writings* (Watts; 6d. each).

Contributions and Comments.

Acts xvi. 30.

IN the new number of *Archiv f. Papyrusforschung* (v. 232), the learned editor, Professor Wilcken, has a brilliant restoration of a desperately fragmentary passage in *Tebtunis Papyri*, ii. 46 (No. 287^{15f.}), which even Drs. Grenfell and Hunt left as a congeries of disconnected letters. Using as his key the procedure in Ac 26³⁰, Wilcken reads ἀναστ[α]ς εἰς [σ]υμ[βούλιον κ]αὶ σκεψάμ[ενος με]τ[ὰ τ]ῶν [. . .]. The judge rises from the bench, and apparently retires to consider the question with his assessors, just as Agrippa, Festus, and Berenice did in the case of Paul. Wilcken notes that the assessors are

often enough referred to, but there is no passage so clear as this for the *ire in consilium*. It is significant enough that in a discussion of this legal procedure the great Mommsen should have overlooked, as Wilcken notes, the obvious case in Acts, and a further example in Philo (ii. 597 M.). Omissions of this kind by some of the greatest of classical scholars are not infrequent.

JAMES HOPE MOULTON.

The Greek Text of Mark vii. 11.

SINCE the days of Erasmus, the last clause of Mk 7¹¹ has uniformly been printed ὁ ἐὰν ἐξέμεω

ὡφελήθης. It is a singular fact that none of the translators or interpreters of the verse goes to the length of translating the subjunctive, which all agree in reading. The subjunctive here must manifestly be due to the character of the clause either as a conditional relative sentence of the vivid future type ('that wherein thou shalt be profited of me'), or as a present general conditional relative sentence ('that wherein thou art profited of me'). The translators, however, almost with one accord introduce a *potential* feeling into the clause; 'By whatsoever thou mightest be profited by me' (Authorized Version); 'That wherewith thou mightest have been profited by me' (Revised Version, American Standard); 'Whatever of mine would have been of service to you' (Twentieth Century New Testament); 'Anything in which you may be profited by me' (Gould); 'Was du von mir haben könntest' (Weizsäcker); 'Whatever it is, which otherwise you would have received from me' (Weymouth); 'What I might have used to aid thee' (Moffatt).

This practically universal impulse to take the clause potentially is certainly not without significance, however questionable it may be as a treatment of a subjunctive with *ἄν* or *εἰάν*. Indeed, it can hardly be supposed that any of these renderings is at all consistent with the accepted text of the passage, since the subjunctive, with or without *ἄν*, is no proper mechanism for the expression of possibility, present or past.

To take the subjunctive as it stands, however, and render it frankly, yields no even tolerable sense. 'That wherewith thou shalt be profited of me is Corban,' and 'that wherewith thou art (general) profited of me is Corban,' are alike inappropriate to the obvious general sense of the passage, which, as every student feels, has been divined by the translators already quoted.

Must we then, as hitherto, do positive violence to the text, in the interest of the context? This would leave Mark, and with him Matthew too, under the charge of a serious solecism. Let us rather, by way of experiment, retranslate into Greek the clause upon which the interpreters agree so well: 'That wherewith thou mightest have been profited by me' is easily represented by *ὃ ἄν ἐξ ἐμοῦ ὡφελήθης*, the potential indicative with *ἄν* representing precisely the feeling desired.

But how does this differ from our text in Mark? In two respects only. *ὡφελήθης*, aorist indicative,

replaces *ὡφελήθῃς*, aorist subjunctive—a purely editorial matter, of which uncial manuscripts, lacking accents and the subjunctive iota, would take no account. Again, *ἄν* stands for *εἰάν*, but this *εἰάν* is itself no proper *εἰάν* at all, but a mere alternative writing for *ἄν* (the Bezan Codex reads *ἄν* here), and Professor Moulton has shown how strongly the first and second centuries preferred *εἰάν* to *ἄν*, particularly in relative clauses of conditional types. This is less easy to establish for specifically potential constructions, yet the acknowledged fondness for *εἰάν*, as compared with *ἄν*, after the relative, is quite enough to account for the presence of *εἰάν* here. The translators have, in a sense, been right; the editors have been wrong. In short, the text, as usually printed, must be reaccented and amended by the omission of the editorial *ι*-subscript, so as to read *ὃ εἰάν ἐξ ἐμοῦ ὡφελήθης*, in accord with the well-nigh universal feeling of its translators.

This is not an entirely novel contention. My colleague, Dr. S. J. Case, points out to me that Professor Blass, in the second edition of his *Grammatik*, p. 210, takes practically this view of the passage (and of Mt 15⁵), although the point he makes is obscured in the second English edition (p. 320) by the misprinting of the vital word, *ὡφελήθης*. 'The ordinary spelling *ὡφελήθῃς* is impossible.' The fact seems to be that the mediæval manuscripts, punctuating and interpreting this clause quite otherwise, gave the verb the traditional form; cf. Luther's rendering, 'Wenn ich's opfere, so ist's dir viel nützer'; and the Vulgate, 'quodcumque ex me, tibi profuerit.' The early editors took it over from the cursives (probably that Basiliensis 2, which Erasmus is said to have sent to the printer), and their successors have never suspected the reading.

EDGAR J. GOODSPEED.

University of Chicago.

Psalm xvii. 15.

THIS verse has offered difficulties to all translators and commentators. See the commentaries, especially Delitzsch (*Die Psalmen*,⁵ pp. 168-169) and Baethgen (*Die Psalmen*,³ p. 48), also H. Kessler (*Die Psalmen*,² 1899, p. 36 [in Strack-Zöckler's 'Kurzgefasster Kommentar']). The main difficulty lies in the word *יִרְרָא*. What does the psalmist mean by 'awakening'? And what kind

of awakening is it? Various explanations have been given. Ewald, for instance, thinks of awakening after the night's sleep; Delitzsch of awakening from the sleep of death; Baethgen of awakening from misery.¹ None of these explanations can be considered satisfactory. It is very improbable that the psalmist should refer to an awakening from misery. Besides, it would give no sense here. Neither can בְּהִקִּיִּן refer to resurrection, as the whole chapter deals with the present life. Neither is Ewald's explanation satisfactory, as this must imply that the psalm was sung in the evening—a theory for which there is no support in the psalm itself. The main question is this: What is the sense of בְּהִקִּיִּן in v. 15^b, especially as there is no reference to a state of sleep in v. 15^a? Only if v. 15^a referred to some kind of sleep, in v. 15^b would בְּהִקִּיִּן be justified. And this consideration seems to have caused the LXX and some other ancient translators² to regard תְּמוּנָתְךָ ('thy likeness') as the subject of בְּהִקִּיִּן (which is, of course, entirely wrong).³

I should like to propose the following solution. What the psalmist wants to say in v. 15 is this: while the wicked are in the possession of all material goods, and enjoy all worldly pleasures (vv. 13, 14), he, the righteous, is happy in his communion with God. All the material goods are nothing. They may vanish at any moment. But the spiritual pleasures are endless. The Divine joys never vanish. Let the wicked deceive themselves with their worldly goods. God they know not. But he, the righteous, has one wish: *always* to see God, *constantly* to be in communion with the Lord. What we have, therefore, to find in v. 15 is the idea 'always.' And this idea is, I believe, really contained in this verse. The verse reads: אֲנִי בְּצֶדֶק אֶחְיֶה. Now, I think that אֶחְיֶה פֶּנִּיךְ אֲשַׁבֵּעָה בְּהִקִּיִּן תְּמוּנָתְךָ, which refers more to spiritual seeing, visions, also means 'to see while sleeping.' Cf., e.g., Is 29⁷,

בְּשֹׁנִים מִחַיֹּנוֹת לַיְלָה, וְהָיָה בְּחֹלֹם חֲזוֹן לַיְלָה; Job 4¹⁸, לַיְלָה, whence we see that חָזַן refers to seeing in the night. Cf. also Gn 15¹, where בְּמַחֲזוֹן seems to refer to a night-vision¹; cf. also v. 12, and Nu 24^{4, 16}. And this meaning, I think, חָזַן has in this verse. I should therefore translate: 'I, in righteousness, see thy face (while sleeping, during the night); I am satisfied with thy likeness while awake (during the day).' Now, 'by night' and 'by day' naturally means 'always'—the idea which the psalmist wanted to express. Note also the fine distinction of פָּנִים and תְּמוּנָה. In sleep he can see God's פָּנִים, 'face'; when awake, however, he can see only His תְּמוּנָה, which is more the reflexion of פָּנִים. Cf. also Nu 12⁸, וְתִמְנַת יְהוָה יֵבִיט—when awake—and Ex 33^{20, 23}—God's פָּנִים cannot be seen by man when awake.² Thus the verse simply expresses the idea that the psalmist will *always* be in communion with God, and this is *his* pleasure. In this way, I believe, the verse becomes quite easy and intelligible.

SAMUEL DAICHES.

Jews' College, London.

The Name of God in Genesis.

I THINK that Dr. Skinner's discussion of this matter in the May number of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES scarcely does justice to my article in the *Bibliotheca Sacra*. That article covered over 50 pages, and I cannot attempt even to summarize it here, but I should like to indicate briefly the main points at issue. The question is not whether Genesis is divisible, but whether a particular clue—and, in consequence, a particular analysis in so far as it rests on that clue—is sound.

To save space I begin by taking a concrete case which happens to illustrate several points simultaneously and then drawing the inferences. It must, however, be clearly understood that this instance is merely one of many that will be found in the *Bibliotheca Sacra* article.

In Gn 16¹¹ an explanation of the name Ishmael is given in which the Tetragrammaton is used. But the Lucianic LXX, the Old Latin and one Hebrew MS. read *Elohim*.

¹ See also Dillmann, *Genesis* (tr. Stevenson), vol. ii. p. 56.

² Through this explanation the remarks of Delitzsch, *l.c.* p. 168, with reference to this question are rendered pointless.

¹ Cf. also Cheyne, *The Book of Psalms*, 1888, p. 44. The suggestion offered therein ('when I awake' may mean 'when life's short day is past') is not tenable either. See also Cheyne, *The Origin of the Psalter*, 1891, p. 389 and p. 430. His emendations and explanations in his *Book of Psalms* of 1904 (p. 58 and p. 62) are, of course, entirely unacceptable.

² See Baethgen, *l.c.*

³ Cf. also Wellhausen, who translates 'at thine awaking' (in Haupt's *S.B.O.T.*, 'The Book of Psalms,' p. 13; see also p. 169). See also G. Beer, *Individual-und Gemeindepsalmen*, p. 18.

1. Dr. Skinner says it is reasonable to expect that Jewish scribes would be more careful in this matter than Greek copyists. But this instance shows that the variant is a *Hebrew* variant, for the mistakes of *Greek* copyists could not possibly influence a *Hebrew* MS. I therefore submit that little reliance can be placed on this argument. For numerous other examples, see pp. 128-130, 150 ff.¹; and for a further body of evidence drawn from the support of other Versions, see pp. 130 f. Once the fact that the Greek rests on Hebrew variants has been established in a number of cases, a presumption arises that it does so in other cases where no independent testimony is preserved; and a case is made for further investigation.

2. Dr. Skinner further thinks that significance attaches to the fact that in a great majority of instances the LXX substitutes God for the Tetragrammaton of M.T. To this there seem to be two answers. (1) If we regard the Tetragrammaton as original in all cases of difference, this canon must make us suspect M.T. wherever any Version substitutes it for *Elohim* or some other word; and I admit that in all such cases a question does arise. But in Genesis this, of course, means that the Tetragrammaton will have to be introduced into numerous passages of 'E' and 'P.' (2) In some cases where there are differences the *Elohim* of the Versions is demonstrably preferable to the Tetragrammaton of M.T. I instance Gn 16¹¹ where the name *Ishmael* requires *Elohim* in the explanation (cp. Israel, Peniel). The Tetragrammaton would require *Ishmayah* as the name. Here, again, other instances will be found on pp. 131 ff. Consequently we cannot hold that the variants are all due to a desire to avoid the Name of God. It would rather seem that some readings are due to a tendency of M.T. to substitute the Tetragrammaton for *Elohim*.

3. Dr. Skinner says that the LXX differs from M.T. in forty-nine cases. But in an enormous number of passages *some* Septuagintal authority, e.g. Lucian in Gn 16¹¹—sometimes only a single cursive—differs from the ordinary LXX reading. By comparing extant Hebrew variants which confirm some of the Septuagintal variants, I have shown (p. 150 f.) that importance attaches to these. Has Dr. Skinner included all such cases in his forty-nine?

4. It used to be thought that the M.T. usage as to the Divine appellations furnished a criterion for the analysis of Genesis. Dr. Skinner describes the point as one 'of considerable, though not of vital, importance in its bearing on the criticism of the Hexateuch,' though he also says that it is now 'but one element (and in the opinion of many critics a very subordinate element) in the analysis of the Hexateuch.' Now I think that by throwing various points into question form I can focus attention on essentials. I accordingly ask your readers to put to themselves the following questions:—

(a) Given the fact (proved in the passages of my article cited in 1, 2, and 3 above) that the Massoretic Text is manifestly insecure in an enormous number of places, and demonstrably wrong in at any rate some of these, is it possible to maintain that on the basis of that text Genesis should be divided (mainly) into three sources, one of which uses the Tetragrammaton, while the other two do not?

(b) Should redactors and glossators be postulated to help out that analysis by removing the Tetragrammaton from passages of 'E' and 'P,' or *Elohim* from passages of 'J' (p. 122 f.)?

(c) Should divisions into sources ever be made on this basis only (p. 123 f.)?

(d) Should 'J' be subdivided into a 'Je' and a 'Jj' on such a basis?

(e) Should the current analysis be maintained in cases where it rests on very little more than the Tetragrammaton? For instance, the bulk of Gn 20 is assigned to 'E.' But in v.⁴ fourteen Hebrew MSS have the Tetragrammaton which is here obviously appropriate. The analysis is supported by the statement that of the two terms for 'maid-servant' the 'E' word is used (v.¹⁷). But the 'J' word also occurs (v.¹⁴), and is assigned to a redactor. Should such a piece of analysis be maintained?

(f) As already stated Dr. Skinner says that the clue is now 'in the opinion of many critics a very subordinate element in the analysis.' Is it possible to refer me to the expression of such an opinion in the published writings of Wellhausen, or Kuenen, or Dr. Driver, or in Gunkel's *Genesis*, or any other authoritative edition of Genesis by a member of the Graf-Wellhausen school?

5. Dr. Skinner's extreme modesty is responsible for my next point. He writes: 'I do not happen to know of any work which deals exhaustively with

¹ The page references are to the *Bibliotheca Sacra* for January 1909 throughout.

the subject from the critical standpoint.' Then he proceeds to indicate generally what he 'imagines to be the view taken by adherents of the prevalent documentary hypothesis.' It must not be inferred that Dr. Skinner is a writer who has no resources save those of his imagination. On the contrary, he is one of the foremost exponents of the hypothesis in question, and when he says that he does not 'happen to know' any work, we may safely conclude that there is no such work. That is to say, although this particular clue has been used for a century and a half, those who used it have not considered whether or not it is textually sound. It is surely remarkable that by adopting Septuagintal readings in three or perhaps four passages the clue disappears altogether (pp. 158-170), for it does not exist in the Greek Bible. And in the test passage Ex 6³, the LXX is supported by the Syriac, Vulgate, Onkelos, and a Karaite MS. Do not these facts deserve consideration?

6. Dr. Skinner says that all that my arguments can ever accomplish is to demonstrate that a few of the facts which the hypothesis set out to explain are less certain than was imagined. My readers must decide for themselves whether or not this is so, but in view of Dr. Skinner's statement it is only right that I should draw attention to the point on p. 157. In Gn 10¹⁹ we read, 'As thou goest toward Sodom and Gomorrah and Admah and Zeboiim.' It is obvious that nobody could define a boundary in these terms after the age of Abraham, when the places named were destroyed (contrast the language of 13¹⁰). It follows that the first composition of this passage cannot be post-Abrahamic. Is there any published presentation of the critical theory in which the existence of Abrahamic or pre-Abrahamic material in our present Pentateuch is recognized? Is it not the case that the current theory assigns this verse to 'J', i.e. to a document composed at least 1000 years after the latest date at which it could have originated?

7. Lastly, Dr. Skinner tells us that the theory rests on a number of characteristic differences, and is not invalidated by my article. To attempt to discuss this in a monthly magazine would take me beyond the limitations that even the most indulgent editor is compelled to impose. In fairness to myself, however, I may be allowed to say that I have published this article not as an

isolated attack, but as one of a series of papers that are appearing in the *Bibliotheca Sacra*, so that anybody who desires to see whether the theory can survive tests on other points can do so by referring to those articles and to my other publications.

HAROLD M. WIENER.

Lincoln's Inn, W.C.

Ear.

THE note in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES for June on the obsolete word *ear* led me to look up the Welsh renderings of the passages referred to. I had no doubt beforehand that the equivalent of *ear* would be the common form '*aredig*,' obviously derived from Lat. *aratum*. But in the first passage cited, Gn 45⁶, 'neither earing nor harvest' appears as '*heb nac âr na medi*.' I know nothing of the history of the word *âr*, but it is probably the Celtic form of the common Aryan root of ἀρόω, *aro*, and 'ear.'

In 1 S 8¹² 'to ear his ground' is represented by '*i aredig ei âr*,' in which the two forms appear side by side. The expression is obviously idiomatic, and would be literally rendered 'to plough his ploughing.' It should be said that in Welsh the forms of the infinitive and present participle are not distinguished.

'Ear' is used to render two Hebrew words, *hārash* and *abad*. But in Welsh a distinction is made. Wherever the latter is found (as Is 30²⁴, Dt 21⁴), the Welsh Bible has the word *llafurio*, 'to labour,' which, when used with reference to land, is the Welsh idiom for *tilling*. Evidently the Welsh translators were anxious to preserve a distinction which they found in the Hebrew.

RICHARD ROBERTS.

Westbourne Grove, London.

A Man under Authority.

I AM afraid neither Canon Carnegie nor Dr. Garvie can claim to have been the original discoverer of the significance of the centurion's word. How old the interpretation is I should not care to say, but it is at least to be found in the *Practical Commentary on Matthew* of that prince of commentators, James Morison.

ALEX. J. GRIEVE.

Romsey.

Mark iii. 21.

THE editor in the June EXPOSITORY TIMES sketched for us an instructive phenomenon, the appearance of a first-rank scholar, Mr. F. C. Conybeare, among the writers for the R.P.A. I have observed a note in Mr. Conybeare's book (p. 72) which might be taken as an illustration of the proverb, Φθείρουσιν ἡθὴ χρηστὸν ὁμιλίαι κακάι. The heading (p. vi) is 'The Pious Frauds of the English Revised Version,' which, by the way, we learn for the first time was 'recently issued by the Episcopal Churches of England and America'! The Revisers have 'falsified the text of Mk 3²¹' by retaining the rendering of the A.V. 'his friends,' where it should be 'his family.' That οἱ παρ' αὐτοῦ does mean 'his family' here I showed by papyrus citations in my *Prolegomena* (p. 106 f.). But I mentioned there also the fact that the phrase is very much more common in the sense 'his agents' or 'representatives.' The translation 'his friends' happens to represent very well the ambiguity of the original; and, as a matter of fact, the evidence which makes 'his family' certain for Mk is its recent appearance in a minority of papyrus passages—all of them, of course, available only since the R.V. was published. The Vulgate *sui*, which is as inclusive as the English, may well have suggested the A.V. phrase. It may be added that 'thy friends' in Mk 5¹⁹ (Vg. *tuos*) is obviously intended to mean 'family.' There is absolutely no evidence that the A.V. or R.V. translators were influenced by bias, and the graceful imputation of fraud is a figment of the R.P.A. imagination. The epithet 'pious' does not mitigate it: a 'pious fraud' is a fraudulent impiety. Mr. Conybeare should read the papyri, and some elementary book on ethics, before he repeats this innuendo against men as honest as himself. As to the 'scandal' of this passage in Mk being still 'acutely felt by orthodox Christians,' I am more than doubtful. Those who have wholly or partially deified Mary may be troubled at the suggestion that she and her younger sons tried to put Jesus under restraint, as being 'beside himself.' But, apart from the absurd fiction of the Immaculate Conception, there is no reason why we should suppose Mary to have been other than one ὁμοιοπαθὴς ἡμῖν. Mark's faithful chronicle is to Protestants only the clearest evidence that Mary was no goddess, but very human, and even weak, in the ease with which she let herself be led into a

deplorable and inexcusable misjudgment of her Son.

JAMES HOPE MOULTON.

Manchester.

[Those who have not seen Mr. Conybeare's book will want to read the whole passage in it to which Professor Moulton refers. Here it is. 'They (Matt. and Luke) both omit Mk 3¹⁹⁻²¹, for in their generation it was become scandalous to suppose that his own family could have set out to restrain Jesus as a madman. How acutely the scandal is still felt by orthodox Christians may be measured by the fact that the authors of the Revised English Version, recently issued by the Episcopal Churches of England and America, have falsified the text of Mk 3²¹, rendering the Greek words οἱ παρ' αὐτοῦ by *his friends* instead of *his household* or *his family*. Yet the old Authorized Version of 1611 correctly sets in the margin Wycliff's rendering *his kinsmen*.'

Now as a supplement to Dr. Moulton's protest, let us remark—

1. That Dr. Moulton's father was a Reviser, and did not belong to an Episcopal Church either of England or of America.

2. That Professor Swete, who belongs to the Episcopal Church of England, and Professor Gould, who belongs to the Episcopal Church of America, are both quite frank in stating that the words probably mean *his relatives* or *family*.

3. That the word *friend* was practically equivalent to *kinsman* when the Authorized Version was made. In the very beginning of the *Pilgrim's Progress*, Bunyan makes Christian say, 'Oh, my dear wife, and you the children of my bowels, I, your dear friend, am in myself undone.' This is still the meaning of the word among the Scotch peasantry. Only a few days ago the writer of this note met one of his parishioners and inquired for his son, who had recently gone to Aberdeen. 'He is lodging with a friend, is he not?' 'Oh no,' replied the farmer, 'not a friend, only an acquaintance.']

Genesis xx. 17, 18 and Herodotus . 105.

THE realistic explanation of the 'Emerods' in the number of April (p. 332) induces me to call attention here to the coincidence between Gn 20^{17, 18} and Herodotus i. 105, which struck me some twenty

years ago, and which I have not found mentioned in any commentary either on Genesis or on Herodotus.

From Gn 20 we learn that Abimelech and his house at *Gerar* suffered from some female weakness. In Herodotus i. 105 it is told that the Scythians ascribed the *θήλεια νοῦσος*, from which their princes suffered, to the Aphrodite, whose temple at *Ascalon* they had plundered. Now *Gerar* is in the nearest neighbourhood to *Ascalon*, if it be not identical with it; in both cases mention is made of a *θήλεια νοῦσος*; surely there must be a connexion between the two narratives, even if it were only this, that such a weakness prevailed in these regions.

EB. NESTLE.

Maulbronn.

‘Abraham rejoiced.’

STRANGE to say, the R.V. with references does not refer in Jn 8⁵⁶ to Gn 17¹⁷, and no commentary

of which I know notices the fact, that the Targum renders קח, to *laugh*, in this verse not by חסד, *laugh*, as in 18¹². 13. 15 19¹⁴, but by ירי, to *rejoice*, to be *glad*; likewise in 21⁹.

That for the whole passage in John much is to be learned by a comparison of the *Book of Jubilees*, has been justly remarked by Th. Zahn in his new commentary. Compare in the translation of Charles (1902), 14, 21, ‘And Abram *rejoiced*’; 15, 17 (= Gn 17¹⁷), ‘And Abraham fell on his face and *rejoiced*’; 16, 19, ‘And they both *rejoiced* with exceeding great *joy*’; further, §§ 20, 25, 26, ‘for He’—must it not be ‘he’ (Abraham)?—knew and perceived that from him would arise *the plant of righteousness* for the eternal generations, and from him a *holy seed*, so that it should become like Him who had made all things.’ Further, §§ 27, 29, 31, ‘He praised and gave thanks to his God for all things with *joy*.’

EB. NESTLE.

Maulbronn.

Entre Nous.

‘The Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics.’

The Publishers inform us that they have just received a large order for copies of the *Encyclopædia* from Japan.

A letter has been shown us from South Africa, which says: ‘I am looking forward to the receipt of my first volume of Hastings’ *Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics*. Quite a number of us in the Transvaal are getting it.’

A review of vol. i. appears in the *Theologische Literaturzeitung* for June 5, where it occupies the first place. The reviewer is Professor Lobstein of Strassburg. It is a thoroughly satisfactory review, capable and appreciative. Such a review in Harnack and Schürer’s influential organ will make the *Encyclopædia* known throughout theological Germany.

The second volume is making good progress. It is now evident that the whole work can be completed easily in ten volumes or even less, and probably within the time that it took to issue the Dictionary of the Bible.

Professor Driver.

It is in every way fitting that Dr. Driver should be presented with his portrait. Not only his old

pupils and friends in Oxford, but a wider circle of students and fellow-workers outside, have agreed that the time is come for marking in this way their appreciation of his immense services. Dr. Driver has been Professor of Hebrew at Oxford for twenty-seven years; and during that time he has trained a succession of Biblical students in the methods of exact scholarship and judicious criticism. But his teaching has travelled far beyond the limits of his own University. Throughout a period which has witnessed a revolution in the study of the Bible, he has been educating opinion all over the country; the whole weight of his learning has gone to strengthen the side of progress, and with a reassuring effect of incalculable value. For he is trusted as few teachers are; sobriety of judgment, reverence, and a scholar’s appreciation of the importance of facts, are some of the qualities which have won for his work its widespread influence. A strong committee has been formed to carry out the proposed presentation; and it is hoped that the picture will ultimately find a permanent place among the portraits of Dr. Driver’s predecessors in the official residence of the Professor of Hebrew at Christ Church, Oxford; the secretaries are the Rev. P. J. Boyer, Rothersthorpe Vicarage, North-

ampton, one of Dr. Driver's earliest pupils, and the Rev. Professor G. A. Cooke, Oriel College, Oxford, to whom subscriptions may be sent.

A Summer School of Theology in Oxford.

A Summer School of Theology is to be held in Oxford in September. It will be opened on the evening of Monday, September 13, with an inaugural lecture by Professor Percy Gardner. It will be closed on Friday, September 24. The complete course embraces about fifty lectures. The fee is £1. Application for tickets should be made to the Rev. A. J. Carlyle, University College, Oxford, or to the Rev. G. W. Thatcher, Mansfield College, Oxford.

What are the subjects of lecture to be, and who are to be the lecturers? The first batch of topics goes by the name of Philosophy of Religion. It is fitting. For religion, the philosophy of it and the experience of it, is now the great absorbing subject of study. Among the lecturers here are Count Goblet D'Alviella of Brussels and Mr. Marett. In the Old Testament department, Professor Driver will lecture on the Psalter. And in the New Testament section Professor von Dobschütz of Strassburg will lecture on the Eschatology of the Gospels. The last section returns to the first. Its title is the Relation of Christianity to other Religions. Dr. Estlin Carpenter will lecture here on Buddhist Parallels to Christianity, a subject of more than fighting value, and Professor Moulton on Comparative Religion as a Help to Religious Synthesis. If we could attend one lecture and only one, we should attend Dr. Moulton's.

A Correction.

Mr. G. H. Gwilliam wishes us to point out that he still holds his Fellowship at Hertford College. He was by a slip represented in last month's issue as *late* Fellow.

While we are confessing, we may add that there was a slip in the quotation of Mr. Maclean Watt's poem, 'The Soul Unveiled'—

I have been away for a night and a day
On (not *at*) the Lord God's judgment seat.

Old Sermons.

Burns found the cottar's wife trying to 'gar auld claes look amaisht as weel's the new.' The process has been tried with sermons. But there are two volumes of sermons issued this month, as

old as old can be. And they are sent forth just as they are, without an attempt to make them look as good as new. Dr. Walter Smith is the author of the one volume, Professor William Knight of the other.

How old Dr. Walter Smith's sermons are we find from such a sentence as this: 'An able and eloquent writer of the day labours, in a high heathenish sort of way, to exalt what he calls *conduct* into the place of chief moment.' Matthew Arnold was living and writing when the sermon was preached. Professor Knight makes no secret of the age of his sermons. He preached some of them before he became a professor, and that is three-and-thirty years ago.

But these old sermons are good reading still. They retain the life that belongs to literature. And one of them might have had as motto St. Paul's words to the Corinthians, 'I determined not to know anything among you save Jesus Christ and him crucified.'

Dr. Walter Smith's volume is called simply *Sermons* (Maclehose; 5s. net). Let us look at a typical sermon, quite typical though the text is unusual. The text is 'Mending their nets' (Mt 4²¹). It is a sermon preached before the preacher's holiday. Simon and Andrew when they were called were fishing; James and John were mending their nets. The preacher's holiday is the time for mending his nets. For the business of the fisherman is to catch fish, not merely to fish for them. And if he finds that the fish are slipping through he must sit down and mend his nets.

This is our supreme business, says Dr. Walter Smith. There are two figures employed, fisher and pastor. Both are employed by Christ and His Apostles. The minister of Christ must be both a fisher and a pastor, but the chiefest and foremost function is the fisherman's. To save the lost is more than to feed the flock. Therefore the Good Shepherd Himself did not scruple to leave the ninety-and-nine in the fold that He might go after that which was lost and find it.

Professor Knight calls his volume *Things New and Old* (Griffiths; 5s. net). The evangelistic note is not quite so persistent, but it is there, however unexpectedly. And how orthodox in doctrine every sermon is. In a day in which men no longer think it necessary to argue for the rigid uniformity of nature's laws, Professor Knight reprints a sermon which seeks to prove that the

effectual fervent prayer of a righteous man may secure a good harvest.

Let us be Scriptural.

The Churches of Scotland have been sitting in General Assembly in Edinburgh. To the General Assembly of the Free Church Major Greig submitted the report of the Psalmody Committee and moved its adoption. But unfortunately, in the course of his report, he used the word 'choir.'

The Rev. A. MacIvor from Elgin objected. The choir, he said, was not recognized in the Free Church. He moved that the word 'choir' should be deleted from the report and the word 'precentor' inserted in its place.

An elder seconded the objection, and the Rev. George Macleod from Stornoway supported it. But the Rev. S. L. Orr from Glasgow was as ill satisfied with precentors as with choirs. He wanted a 'leader of praise.' They all wanted a leader of praise. The question was, What should the leader of praise be called? Mr. Macleod might be content with 'precentor,' but Mr. Orr would have none of it. For 'precentor' was not Scriptural. Let us be Scriptural, he said, and call the leader of praise the 'Chief Musician.'

Philosophy and God.

Messrs. T. & T. Clark have published a new edition of their volume of *Selections from the Literature of Theism* (7s. 6d. net). Both without and within it is one of the most attractive books that they have ever published. It may seem a simple matter to make selections from the great philosophical writers so as to lay out in order their thoughts about God. But not as Professor A. Caldecott and Professor H. R. Mackintosh have done it. To see that the selections were long enough and short enough, to make sure that they sufficiently represented and did not at all misrepresent the writers' thought, and to prevent overlapping—it was no easy task. But in issuing this second edition the editors say 'various suggestions of the pieces have been offered, but none of them with sufficient force to justify the displacement of a present piece in its favour.' Still the second edition is not simply a reprint of the first. There are verbal emendations in it, and additions have been made to the bibliographies.

Christian Science.

We have received only the firstfruits of the literature of Christian Science. The harvest is yet to come. And for many a day it will be controversial literature, in which the wayfaring man will often err. This month presents us with two substantial volumes. And each volume deals with

a special aspect of the subject. Mr. I. M. Haldeman describes *Christian Science in the Light of Holy Scripture* (Revell; 5s. net). Dr. Stephen Paget from the view-point of a physician gives an account of *The Faith and Works of Christian Science* (Macmillan; 3s. 6d. net). We have said Dr. Stephen Paget. The book is published as 'by the writer of *Confessio Medici*,' without the author's name. But the writer of *Confessio Medici* is quite well known to be Dr. Stephen Paget of the Middlesex Hospital, Secretary of the Research Defence Society.

When Christian Science is compared with Scripture it is found to be in direct contradiction to the teaching of Christ and of the Apostles on every single doctrine that the New Testament contains. We have gone through Mr. Haldeman's book and taken a note of the doctrines contradicted, and we cannot think of one that escapes. Mr. Haldeman is quite unbiased. He simply sets down side by side the words of Christian Science and the words of Holy Scripture (being careful always of the context), and we see for ourselves how absolute and without exception the contradiction is. Christian Science says, 'man is incapable of sin'; Scripture says, 'all have sinned and come short of the glory of God.' Christian Science says, 'man is never sick'; Scripture says, 'they brought to Him all sick people.' Christian Science says, 'the body cannot die'; Scripture says, 'it is appointed unto men once to die.' Christian Science says, 'God is not a person'; Scripture speaks of 'the express image of His person.' Christian Science says, 'Jesus is not the Christ'; Scripture asks, 'who is a liar but he that denieth that Jesus is the Christ?'

Pass to Dr. Paget's book. Dr. Paget finds that Christian Science contradicts common sense. Its teaching about animals, for example, is that they are not real, that they are not there, that they are images, reflexions, manifestations, ideas. They have not in reality senses, for they are not in reality selves. The carnivora are not carnivorous, and the vipers are not venomous. Their pleasures and pains, instincts and passions, homing and mating and fighting, are not really in them, but in God, or in us. It does not matter which we say, God or us. Mind is the only I, or Us. Let the bad grammar pass; hold fast this happy assurance, that God is the only Us.

But Dr. Paget has most to do with the cures of Christian Science. He has written to a great many of those who say they were cured. He has thoroughly sifted such cases as he could get at. He does not believe that Christian Science can cure. Mental suggestion, of course, he holds by. But beyond what it does by mental suggestion he does not believe that Christian Science has ever done anything.

The God of the Pluralist.

Professor William James holds emphatic opinions about his philosophical contemporaries, and he expresses them emphatically. No considerations prevent him from saying just what he thinks about Mr. Bradley or Mr. McTaggart; and he has been endowed with an astonishing gift of explanatory language. What chance has an enemy, living or dead, with a man who can use up five different figures of speech within the space of seven successive sentences?

The book contains some Hibbert Lectures which were delivered at Manchester College, Oxford, on the present situation in Philosophy. Its title is *A Pluralistic Universe* (Longmans; 5s. 6d. net). The fourth lecture is on Fechner. Up to that point Professor James has been talking generally against Hegel and the Hegelians. But when he comes to Fechner he becomes serious and even sympathetic. He tells this story. 'Among the philosophic cranks of my acquaintance in the past was a lady all the tenets of whose system I have forgotten except one. Had she been born in the Ionian Archipelago some three thousand years ago, that one doctrine would probably have made her name sure of a place in every University curriculum and examination paper. The world, she said, is composed of only two elements, the Thick, namely, and the Thin.' Well, the Hegelians, the Monistic idealists, the expounders of the Absolute and all their tribe, are thin. They have no substance in their arguments, no reality, no satisfaction. But Fechner's arguments and illustrations are substantial, real, satisfying. Fechner is thick. Professor James believes in Fechner, as he seems to believe in no one else. 'Where there is no vision,' he quotes, 'the people perish. Few professorial philosophers,' he adds, 'have any vision. Fechner had vision, and that is why one can read him over and over again, and each time bring away a fresh sense of reality.'

And the reason why Professor James loves Fechner is that Fechner rejects Monism of every shade of opinion, as Professor James does, and rejoices with him in a frankly pluralistic universe. And what does a pluralistic universe mean? It means that there is a God, a personal God. But it also means that God is finite, either in power or in knowledge, or in both at once.

When I have time.

When I have time, so many things I'll do,
To make life happier and more fair
For those whose lives are crowded now with care,
I'll help to lift them from their low despair
When I have time.

When I have time, the friend I love so well
Shall know no more the weary, toiling days;
I'll lead his feet in pleasant paths always
And cheer his heart with words of sweetest praise,
When I have time.

When you have time! The friend you hold so dear
May be beyond the reach of all your sweet intent,
May never know that you so kindly meant
To fill his life with bright content,
When you had time.

Now is the time! Speed, friend, no longer wait
To scatter loving smiles and words of cheer
To those around whose lives are now so drear;
They may not need you in that far-off year:
Now is the time.

The Great Text Commentary.

The best illustration this month has been found by the Rev. E. Hutchinson, Wollongong, New South Wales, to whom a copy of Rutherford's *Epistles to Colossæ and Laodicea* has been sent.

Illustrations for the Great Text for August must be received by the 1st of July. The text is Rev 2¹⁰.

The Great Text for September is Rev 2¹⁷—'To him that overcometh, to him will I give of the hidden manna, and I will give him a white stone, and upon the stone a new name written, which no one knoweth but he that receiveth it.' A copy of Dr. Robert Scott's *The Pauline Epistles* or of Dr. W. G. Jordan's *Biblical Criticism and Modern Thought* will be given for the best illustration.

The Great Text for October is Rev 3²⁰—'Behold, I stand at the door and knock: if any man hear my voice and open the door, I will come in to him, and will sup with him, and he with me.' A copy of Law's *The Tests of Life* or of Oswald Dykes's *Christian Minister* will be sent for the best illustration.

The Great Text for November is Rev 7^{9, 10}—'After these things I saw, and behold, a great multitude, which no man could number, out of every nation, and of all tribes and peoples and tongues, standing before the throne and before the Lamb, arrayed in white robes, and palms in their hands; and they cry with a great voice, saying, Salvation unto our God which sitteth on the throne, and unto the Lamb.' A copy of Law's *The Tests of Life* or of Scott's *The Pauline Epistles* will be sent for the best illustration.

The Great Text for December is Rev 7¹⁴—'These are they which come out of the great tribulation, and they washed their robes, and made them white in the blood of the Lamb.' A copy of Jordan's *Biblical Criticism and Modern Thought*, or Dykes's *Christian Minister*, or Wilson's *How God has Spoken*, will be sent for the best illustration.

Those who send illustrations should at the same time name the books they wish sent them if successful.

Printed by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, St. Cyrus, Montrose, Scotland.